

FW 2.18: L44/949/ *prelim.*

PRELIMINARY REVISED
REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON

CLOSED STACKS

Gov Docs

LAWS AND ORDINANCES

The President's HIGHWAY SAFETY CONFERENCE

Held in

WASHINGTON, D. C.

JUNE 1, 2, and 3, 1949

OTHER CONFERENCE COMMITTEE REPORTS
ACCIDENT RECORDS . . . ORGANIZED PUBLIC SUPPORT
EDUCATION . . ENFORCEMENT . . PUBLIC INFORMATION
ENGINEERING . . . MOTOR VEHICLE ADMINISTRATION
and the ACTION PROGRAM

Presented by the COMMITTEE ON CONFERENCE REPORTS

✓
F 2.18: L44/949



3 1706 60148443 4

Conference Organization

General Chairman:

MAJ. GEN. PHILIP B. FLEMING
Administrator, Federal Works Agency
Washington, D. C.

Vice Chairmen:

WILLIAM PRESTON LANE, JR.
Governor of Maryland
Chairman, The Governors' Conference
GEORGE W. WELSH
Mayor, Grand Rapids, Mich.
President, United States Conference of Mayors

Executive Director:

RUDOLPH F. KING
Massachusetts Registrar of Motor Vehicles
Boston, Mass.

COORDINATING COMMITTEE

Chairman:

THOMAS H. MACDONALD •
Commissioner, Public Roads Administration
Washington, D. C.

MAJ. GEN. EDWARD H. BROOKS, Director, Personnel and Administration,
General Staff, U. S. Army.

C. W. BROWN, President, American Association of State Highway Officials.

J. A. A. BURNQUIST, President, National Association of Attorneys General.

JUSTUS F. CRAEMER, President, National Association of Railroad and Utilities
Commissioners.

M. C. CONNORS, President, American Association of Motor Vehicle Admin-
istrators.

NED H. DEARBORN, President, National Safety Council.

CLYDE A. ERWIN, President, National Council of Chief State School Officers.

WALLACE J. FALVEY, Chairman, Advisory Group, Accident Prevention Depart-
ment, Association of Casualty and Surety Companies.

COL. HOMER GARRISON, JR., President, International Association of Chiefs of
Police.

JOSEPH F. HAMMOND, President, National Association of County Officials.

DR. R. H. HUTCHESON, President, Association of State and Territorial Health
Officers.

HAROLD P. JACKSON, Chairman, National Committee for Traffic Safety.

PYKE JOHNSON, President, Automotive Safety Foundation.

DELESSEPS S. MORRISON, President, American Municipal Association (Mayor
of New Orleans).

CHARLES A. PETERS, Chairman, Federal Interdepartmental Safety Council.

ROBERT J. SCHMUNK, President, American Automobile Association.

EARL O. SHREVE, President, Chamber of Commerce of the United States.

COMMITTEE ON CONFERENCE REPORTS

Consists of members of Coordinating Committee, Chairmen of Conference
Committees, Regional Officers, and Representatives of each State.

Foreword

IN PREPARING this report special effort has been made to assure accuracy in the numerous references to the traffic laws now in effect in the 48 States and the District of Columbia. Unfortunately, some States republish their traffic laws in pamphlet form only at irregular intervals and it is not certain that the editions made available and examined include in all instances the latest amendments.

Also, in many of the State traffic laws unrelated subject matters are so intermingled that it is difficult to locate or to determine the absence of specific regulations.

Thus your Committee finds itself unable to guarantee complete accuracy in those portions of the report and the tables which follow cataloging numerous traffic rules of the road and other State traffic laws.

Contents

| | Page |
|---|------|
| Foreword | IV |
| Introductory statement | 1 |
| Demand for uniform traffic regulations | 2 |
| Extent of interstate motor traffic | 3 |
| Advantages of and necessity for uniform traffic regulations | 4 |
| Hazards resulting from lack of uniformity | 6 |
| Variances due to local conditions | 10 |
| Importance of uniformity in minimum standards for operators' and chauffeurs' license laws | 12 |
| Importance of uniformity in minimum requirements for registration and certificate-of-title laws | 13 |
| Desirable uniformity, but permissible variance, in safety responsibility laws | 13 |
| Need for adequate State administrative authority | 14 |
| Uniform State traffic laws rather than Federal enactment desirable | 14 |
| Uniform Vehicle Code and Model Traffic Ordinance | 15 |
| History of the Uniform Vehicle Code | 15 |
| History of the Model Traffic Ordinance | 16 |
| Progress attained in uniform traffic laws | 17 |
| Act V.—Uniform Act Regulating Traffic on Highways | 19 |
| Act V, Article I.—Words and Phrases Defined | 21 |
| Act V, Article II.—Obedience to and Effect of Traffic Laws | 23 |
| Act V, Article III.—Traffic Signs, Signals, and Markings | 24 |
| Act V, Article IV.—Accidents | 24 |
| Act V, Article V.—Negligent Homicide, Driving While Intoxicated, and Reckless Driving | 26 |
| Act V, Article VI.—Speed Restrictions | 28 |
| Act V, Articles VII to IX, Inclusive | 30 |
| Act V, Article X.—Pedestrians' Rights and Duties | 32 |
| Act V, Article XI.—Operation of Bicycles and Play Vehicles | 32 |
| Act V, Article XII.—Street Cars and Safety Zones | 32 |
| Act V, Articles XIII to XV, Inclusive | 33 |
| Act V, Article XVI.—Equipment | 34 |

| Progress attained in uniform traffic laws—Continued | Page |
|---|------|
| Act V.—Uniform Act Regulating Traffic on Highways—Continued | |
| Act V, Article XVII.—Inspection of Vehicles | 35 |
| Act V, Article XVIII.—Size, Weight, and Load | 36 |
| Act II.—Uniform Motor Vehicle Operators' and Chauffeurs' License Act | 36 |
| Act I.—Uniform Motor Vehicle Administration, Registration, Certificate of Title, and Antitheft Act | 39 |
| Act III.—Uniform Motor Vehicle Civil Liability Act | 42 |
| Act IV.—Uniform Motor Vehicle Safety Responsibility Act | 43 |
| Model Traffic Ordinance | 45 |
| Summary of findings and conclusions | 47 |
| Recommended measures to obtain uniformity in traffic regulations | 50 |
| Necessity for uniformity in interpretation, application, and enforcement of uniform traffic laws and ordinances | 53 |
| Appendix—Tables | 54 |
| Committee on Laws and Ordinances | 73 |

Report of Committee on **Laws and Ordinances**

INTRODUCTORY STATEMENT

Officials of governmental and private agencies, in fact, all our people, must recognize that modern motor-vehicle transportation and accompanying traffic deaths, personal injuries, and property damage, present numerous problems that require for solution greater wisdom, cooperative effort, and more intensive application of remedial measures than have thus far been demonstrated.

With continuing increases in population, registration of motor vehicles, and volume of traffic, these problems will become progressively more complex and difficult of solution. In determining the nature and scope of measures for solution, it is necessary to evaluate past and present practices and procedures, and by appropriate revision and intensified effort to anticipate and prepare for the future.

In order better to control the operation of vehicles and to accomplish a reduction of accidents, adequate and uniform motor-vehicle laws and regulations are essential. While appropriate enforcement, educational, and judicial procedures must be employed, they are of necessity dependent upon a sound basis of traffic laws and ordinances, explicitly and clearly stated, which will command themselves to our people. The justification for and advantages of those legal restrictions and burdens which are made applicable must be fully demonstrated to our people, for we are freedom loving, we resent dictation as to our personal actions, and abhor even the semblance of a legal strait jacket.

The nature of our people is such that only those measures which appeal to the good sense of the majority will prove successful. It would be dishonest and futile to press for restraints and limitations by which we, as individuals, would refuse to be bound.

In fulfillment of the directive issued to the Committee on Laws and

Ordinances, this report elucidates and emphasizes the demand and necessity for uniform traffic regulations, the extent to which exact textual uniformity in the laws is essential, what basic standards must be established, and the appropriate levels of government that should enact and enforce traffic laws and regulations.

The report reviews the development of the Uniform Vehicle Code and the Model Traffic Ordinance which have long been recognized as national standards. Although these recommended State and municipal enactments will need revision in future years due to increases in traffic volume and changes in the design of vehicles and highways, no criticism has been voiced of their basic principles and no other body of proposed traffic laws and ordinances has been developed which could be regarded as competitive.

The report examines thoroughly the progress thus far attained in uniformity in laws and ordinances affecting traffic, and the extent to which such laws and ordinances conform with the standards embodied in the Uniform Vehicle Code and the Model Traffic Ordinance.

Thorough consideration is given to practical ways and means which can be employed to bring about necessary uniformity. It is recognized that the success which can be attained in respect to the measures recommended and any others which might be devised is dependent upon their approval by the members of this Conference and future cooperative action by all persons and agencies participating. In furtherance of these desirable objectives your thorough consideration and active support are respectfully solicited.

DEMAND FOR UNIFORM TRAFFIC REGULATIONS

The action of President Truman in calling this highway safety conference gives forceful and timely emphasis to the urgent necessity for enactment of modern, comprehensive, and uniform traffic laws and ordinances.

During many years Federal Cabinet members and other officials, several national conferences on street and highway safety, and scores of national associations concerned with motor vehicle transportation, have stressed the need for and have actively supported the principle of uniformity in traffic laws and ordinances. The public press, State highway, police, and motor-vehicle officials, women's clubs, farm organizations, local traffic associations, chambers of commerce, automobile clubs, and many other groups, as well as the public generally, particularly the motoring public, have voiced this demand for uniform traffic laws and ordinances.

The automotive industry and operators of commercial vehicles,

including trucks and busses, particularly those engaged in interstate operation, have urged the enactment of appropriate and uniform standards in size, weight, and equipment requirements and limitations.

It might be deemed unnecessary and unduly reiterative to direct attention to this continuing demand to which almost everyone subscribes, except that uniformity in traffic regulations has not yet been attained.

The demand and necessity for uniformity in traffic regulations has reference to uniformity within each State and municipality thereof, as well as among the several States. Many millions of vehicle-miles per year are traveled within the limits of a single State, between, through, and within the rural and urban areas of the State. Where the vehicle laws of a State and the traffic ordinances of cities therein are in conflict it is important that effective steps be taken to bring about uniformity within the State.

Extent of Interstate Motor Traffic

So far as can be ascertained, there are no statistical records showing the extent to which the 30 million motor vehicles in the United States cross the boundary lines of adjoining States or pass through a number of States to various destinations and return. It is true that a number of States require visiting motorists to obtain permits, but only after a period of grace. Thus, records of such permits give a wholly inadequate picture of the total volume of interstate motor traffic.

One Pacific Coast State requires an official check of all entering motor vehicles and the records disclose the following information:

During the calendar year 1948, a total of 2,267,364 motor vehicles of all types entered the State. These entering vehicles were classified as follows:

| | |
|-------------------------------|---------------|
| Home-state passenger vehicles | 1,038,140 |
| Foreign passenger vehicles | 1,013,441 |
| Home-state trucks | 59,117 |
| Foreign trucks | 110,458 |
| Busses | 46,208 |
| Total motor vehicles | 2,267,364 |

The foregoing total does not include strictly local traffic across the State line, which is not checked.

It is well known that motorists of the United States and Canada in large numbers travel long distances in normal times, passing through numerous States to visit National Parks and National Monuments.

The following tabulation, derived from reports of the National Park Service, shows number of motor vehicles entering three of the National

Parks, number of persons carried, and number of vehicles that were from the home State:

| | Total vehicles | Total persons | Vehicles from home State |
|---------------------|----------------|---------------|--------------------------|
| Yellowstone, Wyo. | 304,919 | 993,462 | 9,859 |
| Grand Canyon, Ariz. | 176,372 | 541,805 | 13,966 |
| Shenandoah, Va. | 272,567 | 900,093 | ¹ 49,000 |

¹ Estimated.

With respect to Yellowstone National Park, the extent of interstate traffic involved is indicated in part by noting the home States or other domiciles of the 304,919 motor vehicles:

| | | | |
|--------------|--------|------------|---------|
| New Jersey | 2,079 | Iowa | 8,916 |
| New York | 5,713 | Missouri | 5,628 |
| Pennsylvania | 2,477 | Texas | 7,652 |
| Michigan | 8,160 | Washington | 12,155 |
| Ohio | 8,161 | California | 29,929 |
| Illinois | 15,638 | Canada | 3,636 |
| Wisconsin | 6,750 | Hawaii | 304 |
| Minnesota | 8,746 | Others | 188,975 |

Similar figures for Grand Canyon National Park are as follows:

| | | | |
|----------|--------|------------|--------|
| New York | 7,354 | Missouri | 5,240 |
| Ohio | 9,566 | Texas | 10,592 |
| Michigan | 8,160 | California | 39,015 |
| Illinois | 12,596 | | |

Estimated figures for Shenandoah National Park are as follows:

| | | | |
|----------------------|---------|------------|---------|
| Pennsylvania | 108,000 | Maryland | 105,000 |
| New York | 60,000 | Ohio | 65,000 |
| District of Columbia | 96,000 | New Jersey | 41,000 |

ADVANTAGES OF AND NECESSITY FOR UNIFORM TRAFFIC REGULATIONS

The advantages of uniformity in traffic laws and ordinances may be measured in terms of increased personal safety, reduction in property damage, better observance of traffic laws, more orderly traffic flow, and extensive economic benefits and savings. The following may be considered the most important advantages of uniformity:

1. The replacement of diverse and conflicting traffic rules and regulations by uniform directives as to traffic movements will result in identical understanding by motorists of the regulations in effect wherever they may be driving.

2. The danger of collisions is greatly lessened by removing uncertainty as to legal requirements and giving improved opportunity to anticipate the actions of other drivers or of pedestrians. This has particular reference to turning movements, the giving of signals, the right-of-way rules, the effect of stop requirements for through highways, pedestrians' rights and duties, and regulations relating to meeting, overtaking, and passing vehicles.

3. Uniform regulations add further to safety by prescribing efficient standard vehicle equipment, including lights, brakes, warning devices, and limitations on the size and weight of individual vehicles and combinations of vehicles.

4. Reduction of collisions involves actual saving of lives, decrease in personal injuries, and lessening of property damage, representing most commendable humanitarian measures and the saving of tremendous economic losses annually.

5. Increased capacity of busy arteries is obtained, traffic streams are more orderly, and fewer irritants and conflicts result when all drivers and pedestrians, including both residents and nonresidents, are enabled to follow the same rules of the road.

6. Only by uniform statutory directives as to traffic movements is it possible to obtain uniform application and enforcement of traffic regulations.

7. Motorists are less frequently subject to arrest or conviction for unintentional or inadvertent violations when requirements are identical in every jurisdiction.

Motorists quickly become accustomed to the regulations to which they are subject, and acquire instinctive habits as to proper and expected action in emergency situations. Such motorists, when traveling in other jurisdictions in which contradictory regulations are effective, instinctively conform with their accustomed practices, which may be entirely erroneous, frequently causing collisions, irritation, and disorder in the traffic stream.

It will be impossible to instill into the minds of the millions of motor-car operators a proper respect for traffic regulations and to obtain complete obedience to the traffic laws and ordinances unless numerous States and municipalities revise present illogical, archaic, and conflicting regulations and adopt sound and uniform directives as to traffic movement.

Uniformity in respect to equipment, and size and weight of vehicles would result in reduced transportation costs by facilitating commercial motor-vehicle transportation of agricultural and other products across State lines. It would make possible economy through mass production of trucks and busses for use in every State and community

and eliminate the necessity for building special-type vehicles for use in States imposing exceptional restrictions.

Uniformity in traffic regulations might also bring many community benefits by increase in tourist traffic, one of the major "industries" in practically all sections of the United States.

Millions of dollars are spent yearly by promotional agencies publicizing and extolling State and local scenic, historical, and other attractions, inviting visitors to come by motor vehicle or other means of transportation. Hotels and resorts widely advertise for patronage. Seldom, if ever, are such solicitations based upon the assurance that the visiting motorist will encounter the same traffic regulations with which he is familiar in his home State.

It would profit States, communities, hotels, resorts and other businesses to publicize truthfully that uniform traffic regulations are in effect, thereby assuring out-of-State motorists that they would not encounter diverse and contradictory regulations.

Hazards Resulting From Lack of Uniformity

Present conflicting State traffic directives create many potential hazards. It is not necessary to draw upon one's imagination; specific reference may be made to present conflicting statutory requirements.

The majority of States have enacted the Uniform Code requirement that motorists approaching a school bus from either direction on a rural highway shall stop when school children are boarding or alighting. Motorists from States which do not have this requirement may fail to obey the law of those States which require that a stop be made, and such failure may result in death or injury to school children who anticipate safe passage across the highway.

Studies of traffic accidents indicate that a very large percentage occur at street and highway intersections and result from non-observance of right-of-way rules. It would be impossible for a motorist traveling across the United States to know all of the present conflicting right-of-way rules. For example, certain States still adhere to the rule that a motorist entering an intersection shall, under all circumstances, yield to vehicles approaching the intersection from the right. Those accustomed to such laws, when traveling in other jurisdictions, will assume an absolute right-of-way over vehicles on the left and may collide with motorists approaching from the left who have entered the intersection first and are entitled to proceed under the different rules with which they are familiar.

A number of States grant an absolute right-of-way to motorists on a through highway. Inevitably there will be conflict with motorists from other States whose laws provide that a motorist entering a through highway shall yield to one within an intersection or approaching so closely as to constitute an immediate hazard, but that having exercised such precautions the driver approaching the through highway may proceed. This latter rule imposes a degree of responsibility upon the motorist on the through highway.

A large percentage of the States require that a signal of intention to turn or decrease speed shall be given, either by means of a mechanical or electrical device, or in the alternative, by means of the hand and arm. The right turn is indicated by extending the hand and arm upward beyond the side of the vehicle; left turn, by extending the hand and arm horizontally; intention to slow or stop, by extending the hand and arm downward at the side of the vehicle. Motorists in States having such standard three position and distinctive hand and arm signals are utterly confused by motorists from other jurisdictions who either give no signal because none is required in their home State, or give the one signal by extending the hand and arm horizontally as indicating that some unusual movement will be made, but without clearly indicating a right or left turn or that a stop will be made.

Table 4, included in the Appendix of this report, describes the methods of giving hand and arm signals in the several States, some of which might be characterized as fantastic.

Uniformity in hand and arm signals is essential, particularly in view of the fact that motorists must frequently make instantaneous determination of the intentions of other drivers and split-second decisions as to proper action to avoid collision.

Another frequent reason for conflict between vehicles arises by reason of the divergence in regulations governing turning movements. A few States require that vehicles shall pass beyond and around the center of an intersection in turning to the left. In many instances this rule imposes impossible conditions and cannot be observed or enforced. On narrow rural highways and many city streets it would be impossible for the operator of a bus or truck or combination of vehicles to effect a left turn in this manner.

Certain other jurisdictions require that left turn movements shall be made by passing inside and to the left of the center of an intersection. The standard rule to which most motorists are accustomed is that they shall approach in the lane for traffic nearest to the center of the highway, and in making the left turn shall leave the intersection to the right of the center of the highway being entered. This per-

mits a practical, easy turning radius and can be complied with at intersections of either small or large area.

It is not difficult to imagine the confusion, irritation, hazard, and opportunity for collision by reason of these three divergent rules governing left turns.

The majority of jurisdictions prohibit **U**-turns between intersections in business districts. Motorists accustomed to obeying such prohibition, but driving in other jurisdictions where **U**-turns are permitted, are taken by surprise and endangered by such movements, frequently performed abruptly and without signal.

A majority of States require that a motorist traveling at night shall depress or dim the headlamp beams of the motor vehicle upon approaching within 500 feet of another vehicle coming from the opposite direction. However, a substantial number of States do not require that the headlamp beams shall be depressed or dimmed. Thus, many motorists, accustomed to depressing or dimming their headlights as required in their home States, are disconcerted and may run off the highway when meeting other motorists who do not comply with this safe and courteous practice.

About half of the States have declared it unlawful for a person to stand in a roadway for the purpose of soliciting a ride. The person so unlawfully soliciting a ride is guilty of a misdemeanor, but generally no penalty is imposed upon the operator accepting the "hitch-hiker" as a guest passenger. It is easy to imagine the surprise of motorists accustomed to such provisions to find that the motorist, himself, is guilty of a misdemeanor in certain jurisdictions in granting a ride to a serviceman or other person who has indicated a request for a ride while standing on the shoulder of a roadway.

Traffic accident records disclose that in urban areas more than one-half of all traffic fatalities and injuries involve pedestrians. In certain jurisdictions the laws provide that pedestrians shall not cross a roadway against a traffic signal indicating "Stop". In a large number of States a pedestrian may cross a roadway against a stop signal but is required to yield the right-of-way to any approaching motor vehicle. A substantial number of States impose no limitations whatever in respect to a pedestrian crossing against stop signals.

In a large number of jurisdictions the laws provide that at intersections where there are no traffic signals drivers of vehicles shall yield the right-of-way to any pedestrian within a crosswalk. This rule is not uniform, however, and in a substantial number of State vehicle codes no obligation is imposed upon the driver of a vehicle to yield the right-of-way to a pedestrian in a crosswalk. These dis-

crepancies in the regulations applicable to motorists and pedestrians increase the hazard of collisions resulting in death or personal injury.

As a matter of fact, it is difficult to determine what the law is in some States with respect to pedestrians' rights and duties. Table 7 gives the best information available.

There is lack of uniformity in traffic signs, signals, and markings and their legal meanings.

With respect to signals, while red, yellow, and green are the generally accepted directives to stop, exercise caution, or proceed, numerous variations in the use of these colors, singly or in combination in different jurisdictions cause confusion to motorists from other jurisdictions. For example, in some jurisdictions green arrows restricting "Go" movements to certain directions must be accompanied by red, while in others this is not required. In some localities red and yellow in combination require vehicle traffic to stop and direct pedestrians to proceed. In some areas right turns on a red signal are permitted. In some areas yellow is omitted entirely.

With respect to pavement markings, use of solid center lines in some States is confined to curves, hill crests, or other hazardous locations where overtaking and passing is prohibited, while in other States solid center lines are used on straight sections and no-passing zones are indicated by various other types of marking, utilizing yellow, white, or both, and solid or broken lines, or both.

In numerous jurisdictions a yellow line on the right of the center of the roadway indicates no passing to the left by reason of a vertical curve or other conditions involving obstruction to view. In other jurisdictions the presence of the yellow line to the right of the center indicates freedom to cross, as no obstructions to vision will be encountered. Obviously, such contradictory indications by yellow lines is utterly confusing to the motorist and may occasion head-on collisions through misunderstanding of the warning intended.

As to signs, while most of the States have agreed upon standard colors, shapes, and symbols, there are still considerable variances, especially in cities.

It is not surprising that motorists are confused, misled and often disgusted by reason of conflicting directives as to traffic movement and the absence of uniformity in traffic signs, signals, and markings. It is desirable that street and highway officials compromise their differences and adopt uniform highway signs and markings.

Although the foregoing indictment and recital of conflicts in traffic regulations is by no means complete, the illustrations set forth exemplify some of the hazards to life and limb due to lack of uniformity in traffic laws and ordinances.

Variances Due to Local Conditions

Frequently the plea is expressed that absolute uniformity in traffic regulations is impossible, due to variance in local conditions in different jurisdictions. This contention merits thorough consideration and critical analysis in order to determine whether it is possible to incorporate in the uniform requirements provision for necessary variances to be indicated by special signs, or whether the plea that conflicting regulations are necessary to meet local conditions is merely an excuse for willful or unintelligent nonconformance.

It is recognized that some specific directives as to traffic movements must be altered in some instances to facilitate or safeguard traffic, because of unusual hazards caused by volume of traffic or unusual physical characteristics of the highways.

The desirability of uniform statutory provisions in reference to speed limitations in business, residential, and rural areas is generally recognized. Special conditions may require special speed limitations which cannot readily be described by general State law. This has given rise to statutory authorization to determine and designate certain speed zones. All such zones must be adequately signed, in order to inform those approaching and driving within such zones. If the speed restrictions in such zones are reasonable in view of the conditions, and appropriate signs are in place, such variance is not abhorrent to the motorist, and compliance may be obtained by education and enforcement. The desirability of establishing such speed zones is no argument against uniform speed regulations otherwise applicable.

In connection with left turn movements complicated by volume of traffic or unusual arrangement or type of intersections, the Uniform Vehicle Code and many State statutes recognize that special treatment may be required, and definite provision is made that the statutory directives as to turning movements shall apply, except that local authorities may cause markers, buttons, or signs to be placed within or adjacent to intersections and thereby require and direct the particular course to be traveled by vehicles in turning movements at such intersections.

Thus the Uniform Code specifies what exceptions are permitted and how such exceptions shall be indicated. It may be assumed that motorists will observe and heed special directives by signs and markings recognized as appropriate to facilitate and safeguard traffic movements.

Neither Act V of the Uniform Code nor any of the State traffic laws prohibit left turns at intersections. This is a matter which must be left for local administrative determination. Volume of traffic at certain intersections may necessitate prohibition against left turns, to be

indicated by signs stating "No Left Turn," placed at such intersections and readily visible to approaching motorists.

In respect to overtaking and passing, there are certain State laws and local ordinances that require in every event that overtaking and passing shall be to the left of the overtaken vehicle. The Uniform Vehicle Code and numerous State laws and local ordinances recognize that overtaking and passing on the right is not only customary, but desirable under certain specified conditions in order to make full use of roadway widths as set forth in the text of the uniform regulations. If a State law prohibits overtaking and passing upon the right in any event, and other States permit such method of overtaking without appropriate limitations, utmost confusion will result.

Experience shows that it is possible, by uniform State laws, to require overtaking and passing on the left on narrow highways, a practice based on custom, but at the same time to specify precisely those conditions under which overtaking and passing on the right may be permitted in order that all motorists, from whatever home States, may observe uniform practices in overtaking and passing other vehicles.

Many State vehicle codes contain general directives prohibiting parking other than on the right side of the roadway and parallel with the right-hand curb or edge of the roadway. This standard directive should be the general rule even though it may be desirable in some communities to permit angle parking on certain wide streets when this method is indicated by signs or pavement markings. Motorists may be appropriately advised by signs and markings, and such variance as to method of parking should not be regarded as an objectionable divergence from uniformity.

Local conditions frequently necessitate time limits on parking, or prohibition against parking on certain streets, to be indicated by appropriate signs, but these variances are not pertinent in respect to hazards incident to traffic movements.

Certain conclusions can be stated as follows:

1. State vehicle codes and municipal traffic ordinances should be uniform as to the general directives applicable to traffic movements.
2. Such State statutes and ordinances may definitely describe or expressly permit certain necessary variances due to local conditions, and any such variances should be indicated by appropriate signs or markings.
3. The plea that desirable uniformity in traffic regulations cannot be attained, due to local conditions, is untenable.

Certainly there is no good reason for variance in respect to serious

offenses, such as driving under the influence of intoxicating liquor, duty to stop in the event of accident and to render aid, duty to report accidents, and reckless driving.

Also, there should be identical statutory directives in reference to such matters as driving on the right side of the roadway, overtaking and passing, turning movements, right-of-way, pedestrians' rights and duties, special stops for through highways and railroad grade crossings, and uniformity as to standard required equipment, including lights, brakes, horns, mirrors, and windshields.

The State law should describe and limit those variances which may be determined by local or administrative authorities to meet special or local conditions and definitely require that notice of any such variances shall be given by uniform standard signs and markings.

Importance of Uniformity in Minimum Standards for Operators' and Chauffeurs' License Laws

There is general agreement that every State should require the licensing of operators and chauffeurs, and the standards generally recommended are enumerated in that part of this report discussing the Uniform Operators' and Chauffeurs' License Act (Act II) of the Uniform Vehicle Code.

Most assuredly every State should adopt uniform and adequate standards in respect to the licensing of all persons permitted to drive motor vehicles on public highways. Uniformity as to standards is most desirable in order that each State may recognize operators' and chauffeurs' licenses issued in sister States. This is important from the point of view of motorists driving in other jurisdictions. Such motorists, however, are not concerned with textual identity in respect to the licensing laws, except as to a few specific directives to operators and chauffeurs when actually driving upon the highways.

All motorists are immediately concerned with and should be subject to uniform requirement that every licensee shall have his operator's or chauffeur's license in his immediate possession at all times when operating a motor vehicle, and shall display the same upon demand by a justice of the peace, authorized peace officer, or representative of the licensing department. Every operator and chauffeur should likewise be subject to uniform directives as to unlawful use of license, such as prohibition against representing as his own any operator's or chauffeur's license not issued to him, or the lending of a license to any other person, or knowingly permitting the use thereof by another. Outside of these necessary directives to motorists as to the carrying and use

of licenses, it is not essential, although it is desirable, that the license laws be absolutely uniform as to text.

But the necessity for adequate standards in the licensing of operators and chauffeurs is clear. This report, in discussing Act II of the Uniform Vehicle Code, demonstrates the desirability of its enactment without substantial variance by each and every State.

Importance of Uniformity in Minimum Requirements for Registration and Certificate-of-Title Laws

This report, in discussing Act I of the Uniform Vehicle Code, enumerates the desirable basic requirements in respect to the subject matters dealt with therein, including registration and certificate of title laws.

Identity as to the text of State law provisions is desirable, but not absolutely essential, except as to specific directives to persons operating upon the highways. Among such directives are the requirements that valid license plates shall be displayed upon each and every vehicle subject to registration, to be securely fastened in horizontal position in a place and position to be clearly visible, and to be maintained in a condition to be clearly legible.

Likewise, there should be uniformity as to text in respect to registration cards to be carried in the vehicle, or by the person driving or in control of the vehicle, who shall display the same upon demand of a police officer or authorized representative of the registration department.

Desirable Uniformity, but Permissible Variance, in Safety Responsibility Laws

Among all the laws applicable to motorists, the safety responsibility laws have been the least static, as new concepts have been developed and incorporated by various States.

This report, in discussing the Uniform Safety Responsibility Act (Act IV) of the Uniform Vehicle Code, describes the recently developed security provisions incorporated in Act IV by revision within the past several years.

It is generally recognized that some form of safety responsibility act is desirable and most beneficial, and that every such act should incorporate certain basic minimum requirements, but precise textual uniformity is not a matter of vital concern in the actual operation of

motor vehicles on highways except for a few directives such as the reporting of accidents in respect to which definite uniform requirements should be imposed.

Need for Adequate State Administrative Authority

Effective administration of motor-vehicle laws requires that a department of the State government be established, with adequate financial support, and appropriate division of functions as to registration of vehicles, licensing of drivers, and patrol of the highways. It is desirable that substantially uniform provisions be made as to the authority of such department in respect to the registration of vehicles and the licensing of drivers. Further, it is desirable that there be substantial uniformity in respect to the powers and duties of State highway patrols, but identity of statutory text is not an absolute essential.

Assuming that adequate provision is made for State administrative authority, some variance as to method of organization would be immaterial.

Uniform State Traffic Laws Rather Than Federal Enactment Desirable

Several national conferences on street and highway safety, numerous Federal and State officials, and the public generally, have taken the position that centralization of highway traffic control in the Federal Government is undesirable; that such control is primarily for the States, and that uniform traffic regulation has its foundation in uniform State laws and municipal ordinances.

Under the Constitution, the division of powers as between the Federal Government and the States is such that while Federal regulation of interstate traffic is legally permissible and has been exercised by certain measures, such as the Dyer Act, and through the Interstate Commerce Commission in respect to interstate motor carriers, the Federal authority has not generally been deemed applicable to State or municipal police matters, including the regulation of intrastate and local vehicular traffic. The Congress of the United States has expressed its conception of the appropriate functions of the Federal Government in highway traffic matters by the enactment of the Federal-aid highway laws. These Federal laws vest broad jurisdiction in the Public Roads Administration in respect to determining and requiring certain standards in highways receiving Federal aid.

The Federal Aid Highway Act of 1944 vested in the Public Roads

Administration and the Commissioner of Public Roads authority to supervise and approve traffic regulatory and warning signs, signals, and markings on streets or highways constructed with Federal aid in any State. The Congress has not, however, deemed it necessary or desirable to attempt enactments generally applicable to all traffic in all States and localities.

During the war period certain proclamations and directives were issued, calling for reduction of speed to 35 miles per hour upon all public highways. While there was ample authority under the war powers measures for such directives, no attempt was made by the Federal Government to set up machinery for enforcement. The Federal courts, attorneys, and enforcement agencies are not equipped to deal generally with offenses against traffic laws.

If the Congress should enact a uniform traffic code to be applicable in every State and locality there would immediately arise problems with respect to duplication in administration, judicial jurisdiction, and enforcement agencies.

The calling of this conference by the President of the United States, through the Federal Works Administrator and the Commissioner of Public Roads, is an admirable expression of the proper function of the Federal Government in directing attention to the serious highway traffic problems and the need for remedial measures to be accomplished, in the major part, through State and local agencies.

UNIFORM VEHICLE CODE AND MODEL TRAFFIC ORDINANCE

History of the Uniform Vehicle Code

In 1924, the then Secretary of Commerce called a national conference on street and highway safety, attended by representatives from every State. A number of national associations cooperated with the Department of Commerce in organizing and financing the conference.

The first National Conference on Street and Highway Safety stressed the importance of appropriate traffic laws governing the movement and equipment of motor vehicles and recommended a program of future activities, including a proposal for subsequent convening of the National Conference. A committee on uniformity of laws and regulations was appointed, which, during the period 1925-1926, prepared the original text of the Uniform Vehicle Code. In the writing of the Code, consideration was given to then existing State traffic laws and local ordinances and endeavor was made to assemble from such State laws the most appropriate and desirable regulations.

The Uniform Vehicle Code was presented to and thoroughly considered by the second National Conference on Street and Highway Safety in March of 1926, and, after partial revision, it was approved and recommended for adoption by the several States.

The National Conference of Commissioners on Uniform State Laws participated to a large extent in the drafting of the text of the Uniform Code, which was approved by the Commissioners and by the American Bar Association.

The National Conference on Street and Highway Safety reviewed and revised the text of the Code in 1930 and 1934. In each case the revisions were based on thorough study by its committee on uniform traffic laws and ordinances extending over a period of months prior to each of the Conferences.

During the years since 1926 the original committee, with certain changes in personnel, has met at rather frequent intervals and added new provisions or revised certain sections of the Uniform Vehicle Code as the result of experience in the practical operation of the Code, and by reason of increase in motor-vehicle traffic and new developments in the design and construction of highways and vehicles.

In 1938 the committee reviewed and revised the Code. In 1944 the committee held two meetings and included certain new provisions in Acts IV and V and revised other portions of the text of each Act. A further review was made in 1947-48 by the reorganized National Committee on Uniform Traffic Laws and Ordinances.

The Uniform Code has been divided into five Acts, as seemed appropriate in respect to subject matter, and in order that one or more Acts of the Code might be separately enacted by State legislatures without the necessity of enactment of the entire Code at any one session, which might be regarded as an unduly formidable undertaking.

The several Acts of the Code are entitled as follows:

- Act I—Uniform Motor Vehicle Administration, Registration, Certificate of Title and Antitheft Act.
- Act II—Uniform Motor Vehicle Operators' and Chauffeurs' License Act.
- Act III—Uniform Motor Vehicle Civil Liability Act.
- Act IV—Uniform Motor Vehicle Safety Responsibility Act.
- Act V—Uniform Act Regulating Traffic on Highways.

History of the Model Traffic Ordinance

The first Model Traffic Ordinance was prepared in 1927-28 by the National Conference on Street and Highway Safety. It was reviewed and revised by the Conference in 1930, and again in 1934. There-

after the committee on uniform traffic laws and ordinances at intervals has reviewed and revised the Model Traffic Ordinance and as recently as December 1945, prepared a rearrangement and revision of a portion of the text.

The Model Ordinance is intended to supplement State vehicle codes and to provide the basis for municipal traffic regulations.

Both the Uniform Vehicle Code and the Model Traffic Ordinance have been endorsed and actively sponsored by numerous official and unofficial agencies participating in the work of the National Conference, including the Public Roads Administration of the Federal Works Agency; American Association of Motor Vehicle Administrators; American Automobile Association; American Mutual Alliance; American Transit Association; Association of American Railroads; Automobile Manufacturers Association; Chamber of Commerce of the United States; Association of Casualty and Surety Companies; National Safety Council; National Highway Users Conference; and others directly interested in highway transportation and traffic safety.

The several Acts of the Uniform Vehicle Code and the Model Traffic Ordinance cannot be regarded as absolutely static in respect to all of their provisions. Changes in highway design, increase in traffic volume, as well as experience in application of various Code and Ordinance provisions in the several States and municipalities will no doubt indicate need for further consideration and some revision of or additions to the text of the Code and Ordinance. Thus, there is need for the continued functioning of the committee on uniform traffic laws and ordinances.

PROGRESS ATTAINED IN UNIFORM TRAFFIC LAWS

This report is based upon an extensive survey of State traffic laws and municipal traffic ordinances conducted with the view of determining the extent to which uniformity has been attained in such regulations and the extent of conformance with the Uniform Code and Model Ordinance.

It would not suffice, however, to consider only a present-day comparison. The progress toward uniformity must be gaged by reviewing the developments during a long period of years. It is reliably reported that surveys and comparisons of State vehicle laws and municipal traffic ordinances in effect prior to 1926 demonstrated an almost chaotic condition. The majority of State traffic laws were wholly inadequate, in many respects unduly restrictive, unsound, and in serious conflict one with another.

The same condition prevailed in regard to municipal traffic ordinances which were not only in conflict one with another in neighboring cities and communities, but also irreconcilable with State laws.

During the period 1926-49, the five Acts of the Uniform Vehicle Code and the Model Ordinance have been widely enacted, thus bringing about very substantial and most gratifying progress toward uniformity in traffic laws and ordinances.

Many States have enacted one or more Acts of the Uniform Vehicle Code during past years, but have not since revised their State laws to comply with revisions of the Code. Many other States have incorporated verbatim various sections of Act V, including rules of the road and equipment provisions, or by revision of their operators' and chauffeurs' license laws have incorporated some, but not all, of the basic provisions of Act III of the Code.

During recent years there has been frequent revision of the safety responsibility laws and, as previously mentioned, Act IV of the Uniform Code was revised by the inclusion of additional security provisions as recently as 1944, based upon the most advanced provisions in a limited number of States.

It is difficult to classify each State as to conformance with the Uniform Code. The following States, however, can reasonably be classified as having adopted one or more of the Acts of the Code other than Act III. (Act III is not included because its provisions are not in general closely interrelated, and it is discussed later in this report.)

| | | | |
|--|--------------|----------------|--------------|
| Alabama | IV | Nebraska | IV |
| Arizona | IV | Nevada | II |
| Arkansas | I, II, V | New Hampshire | IV |
| California | I, II, IV, V | New Jersey | IV |
| Colorado | II, IV, V | New Mexico | I, II, IV, V |
| Connecticut | IV | New York | IV |
| Delaware | I, II, IV, V | North Carolina | I, IV |
| Florida | II, IV, V | North Dakota | I, II, IV, V |
| Georgia | IV | Ohio | I, II, IV, V |
| Idaho | I, II, IV, V | Oregon | II, IV, V |
| Illinois | IV, V | Pennsylvania | I, II, IV, V |
| Indiana | IV | Rhode Island | IV |
| Iowa | IV, V | South Dakota | IV |
| Kansas | II, IV, V | Tennessee | I, II, IV, V |
| Kentucky | IV | Texas | II, V |
| Maine | IV | Utah | I, II, IV, V |
| Maryland | I, II, IV, V | Vermont | IV |
| Massachusetts | IV | Virginia | I, II, IV |
| Michigan | I, II, IV, V | Washington | I, II, IV, V |
| Minnesota | II, IV | West Virginia | I, II, IV |
| Mississippi | V | Wisconsin | II, IV, V |
| Missouri | IV | Wyoming | II, IV |
| Montana | IV | | |
| Total States | | | 45 |
| Total Acts of the Uniform Code adopted | | | 103 |

Thus it will be observed that all but three of the States—Louisiana, Oklahoma, and South Carolina—can be regarded as having in effect at least one Act of the Uniform Vehicle Code. The laws of these three include provisions of the Code in text or substance. Unfortunately in the case of these States as well as some others credited with having one or more Acts of the Code, they have changed the text of various provisions and to that extent nullified desirable conformity. They have failed to realize that there are sound reasons why the text of the Code has been adopted and why other wording has been rejected which on first impression might seem desirable. This is particularly true with respect to Act V, which prescribes the rules of the road for drivers and pedestrians, and in which verbatim uniformity is highly desirable.

In the appendix are numerous tables showing as accurately as practicable the extent of uniformity and conformity with the Uniform Code.

In the following pages the various Acts of the Code are reviewed, both as to the basic principles and specific subjects.

Act V—Uniform Act Regulating Traffic on Highways

Certain legal characteristics of the rules of the road in Act V should be emphasized. It is difficult, but not impossible, to express strict legal requirements in simple, nontechnical language. Traffic education and enforcement officials, and motorists generally, should keep in mind also the three separate, though interrelated, purposes of the rules of the road:

1. The major purpose of the traffic laws is to set forth certain specific rules of the road based largely on custom and designed to render use of the highways safe, to avoid conflicts between vehicles and pedestrians, and to facilitate traffic movements.
2. It is desirable to enact these rules in the form of penal statutes, a penalty by fine or imprisonment, or both, to be imposed for any violation.
3. The traffic laws are effective also in governing the civil rights of one party to collect damages from another in the event of a collision resulting in property damage or personal injury.

Thus the rules of the road must meet all requirements of civil law defining legal rights as between individuals and also comply with the strict requirements applicable to penal statutes, violations of which are offenses against the people of the State. Judicial decisions have emphasized that penal statutes must be definite in order that every

person may know what act of commission or omission will result in penalty.

There are certain rules of the road that may be definitely expressed, as for example:

"The driver of a vehicle shall stop at a stop sign"; also, "No vehicle shall at any time be driven through or within a safety zone."

There is no ambiguity and no flexibility in these rules, and they are typical of the usual form of penal statutes.

Upon first impression, it would appear entirely possible to state all traffic rules thus briefly and categorically. Unfortunately, this is not possible for the reason that certain traffic situations cannot be appropriately governed by such rigid rules. Let us consider the statutory directive that the driver of a motor vehicle shall not follow another vehicle more closely than is reasonable and prudent, having due regard for the speed of such vehicles and the traffic on, and condition of, the highway. It is obvious that this rule appeals to and relies on the judgment of the individual driver. It is difficult to apply and to enforce this rule as a penal statute. However, having regard to variable speeds of motor vehicles, and required safe distance between vehicles proceeding in the same direction, it would appear impossible more definitely to express the intent of the law.

As previously mentioned, the traffic rules also determine the civil right of one driver involved in a collision to recover damages from another by reason of the latter's negligence or failure to observe some rule of the road. Thus, the traffic rules must be so stated that one driver complying with them will not be barred from recovery of damages from another who is clearly at fault.

This problem can be illustrated by the difficulty in appropriately stating the rules to apply in making a left turn at an intersection. It would be possible, although not desirable, to declare that in every event the driver turning left shall yield to vehicles approaching from the opposite direction and proceeding straight through the intersection. Such a rule would have the advantage of certainty. However, it is not practical, or desirable, from two points of view.

Such statement of the rule would place upon the driver turning left the entire burden of avoiding collision in making such turn. In many instances, it would prevent the left turn movement because of approaching vehicles some distance from the intersection. Furthermore, even though the driver turning left exercised every reasonable precaution, if he was struck while making the turn by a driver from the opposite direction traveling at excessive speed and with defective brakes, he would have no right to recover damages.

Viewing this situation impartially, the driver having yielded and

having given signal before turning left and having exercised every reasonable precaution, should not be held to have been negligent as a matter of law and denied the right to recover damages from the other party whose improper driving caused the collision. Thus the Uniform Vehicle Code, in the rule relative to left turns at intersections, preserves the civil right of the driver turning left to recover damages by reason of collision when caused by the negligent or reckless conduct of the driver approaching from the opposite direction.

The Uniform Code rule is stated as follows:

The driver of a vehicle within an intersection intending to turn to the left shall yield the right-of-way to any vehicle approaching from the opposite direction which is within the intersection or so close thereto as to constitute an immediate hazard, but said driver, having so yielded and having given a signal, when and as required by this act, may make such left turn and the drivers of all other vehicles approaching the intersection from said opposite direction shall yield the right-of-way to the vehicle making the left turn.

The latter portion of this section imposes a duty to exercise due care upon the driver of a vehicle approaching the intersection from the opposite direction and only by such statement is it possible to safeguard the civil rights of the driver making the left turn to recover damages when he has exercised every reasonable precaution in making the left turn.

The foregoing discussion and examples illustrate the dual nature of the rules of the road: First, they are penal statutes and must meet the requirements of such statutes; second, the traffic laws affect the civil right of one party to collect damages from another in the event of a collision. The enactment in various jurisdictions of the rules of the road as set forth in Act V has afforded opportunity for numerous judicial decisions pertaining thereto. Such decisions have upheld the regulations as set forth as penal statutes and in civil actions the decisions have interpreted and applied such rules in determining whether one or another driver involved in a collision is entitled to recover damages or whether each such driver was guilty of negligence and no recovery should be allowed to either.

The foregoing discussion and analysis lends further emphasis to the need for enactment in each jurisdiction of the text of the rules of the road as set forth in Act V, in order that there may be uniformity in observance, enforcement, and application, both in civil and criminal proceedings.

Act V, ARTICLE I—WORDS AND PHRASES DEFINED

Uniformity in respect to definitions of words and phrases employed in motor vehicle legislation is of the utmost importance. Assuming that several States enact the same regulatory measures, but employ

terms which are not uniformly defined, then the regulations, although identical in wording, will not have the same application.

The Uniform Vehicle Code definitions of numerous words and phrases are based upon standard dictionary definitions, common understanding, and usage in vehicle laws. Where identical words and phrases are defined in the several Acts of the Code and in the Model Ordinance, the definitions are the same.

In Acts I and V of the Uniform Vehicle Code and in the Model Traffic Ordinance, those words and phrases defined have been grouped according to subject matter into three subdivisions;

1. Vehicles and equipment.
2. Governmental agencies, persons, owners, etc.
3. Highways, restricted districts, zones, etc.

This method of grouping permits consideration in appropriate sequence of related terms, such as "vehicle," "motor vehicle," "motorcycle" and other classes of vehicles; likewise, consideration in appropriate sequence of the terms "street or highway", "private road or driveway", "roadways" and other descriptive terms relating to highways. The reading and comparing of related terms in appropriate sequence for complete and accurate understanding is far more difficult if the terms defined are arranged alphabetically. In Acts II, III and IV the definitions included, few in number, are set forth in only one or two subdivisions.

Examination of State traffic laws discloses that practically all of the 45 States listed on page 18 as having enacted one or another of the Acts of the Code, have adopted the standard definitions as found in Article I of Act V and the other Acts of the Uniform Code. Municipal ordinances quite generally include the standard definitions as set forth in the Uniform Code and Model Traffic Ordinance.

The Federal Motor Carrier Act, enacted by Congress in 1935, contains a variance in respect to the definition of motor vehicles and illustrates the problems occasioned by inappropriate or artificial definitions.

In the Motor Carrier Act, the term "motor vehicle" is defined as follows:

Sec. 203 (13). As used in this part, the term "motor vehicle" means any vehicle, machine, tractor, trailer or semitrailer propelled or drawn by mechanical power and used upon the highways in the transportation of passengers or property, but does not include any vehicle, locomotive or car operated exclusively on a rail or rails. * * *

It will be noted that the term "motor vehicle" is defined to include trailers and semitrailers, which are not self-propelled or equipped with motive power. Thus, the definition of motor vehicle is inaccurate and artificial, and has given rise to numerous problems in preparing

the text of the Motor Carrier Safety Regulations adopted by the Interstate Commerce Commission.

In such regulations it is necessary to adopt additional inaccurate and artificial definitions, as for example:

The term "semitrailer" means any motor vehicle other than a "pole trailer" or a motor vehicle transported in drive-away operations by means of a "saddle-mount" with or without motive power and designed to be drawn by another motor vehicle and so constructed that some part of its weight and that of its load rests upon the towing vehicle.

The foregoing definition is not in accordance with common understanding and trade usage of the term "semitrailer", which actually is not a motor vehicle, and this and other artificial definitions in the Motor Carrier Safety Regulations render it very difficult for those subject to such regulations to identify readily the application of numerous regulations employing such artificial terms.

Act V, ARTICLE II—OBEDIENCE TO AND EFFECT OF TRAFFIC LAWS

It is expressly declared unlawful and a misdemeanor for any person to do any act forbidden or to fail to perform any act required in Act V, thus rendering it unnecessary to repeat the words "it is unlawful" or "it is a misdemeanor" in each section of the Act. Also the text requires every person to obey lawful traffic orders by police officers.

Public officials are required to obey the traffic laws, subject to certain exceptions in reference to drivers of authorized emergency vehicles. Also every person riding an animal or driving an animal-drawn vehicle shall be subject to the rules of the road.

It is expressly declared that the provisions of the Act shall be applicable and uniform throughout the State, although this shall not prevent municipalities and other local authorities as defined from regulating traffic by means of police officers or traffic control signals nor from enacting regulations as to parking and certain other specified subjects which could not appropriately be dealt with by uniform State law.

The statutes of all States require obedience to the traffic laws either in general terms or by providing individual penalties for each offense, and 42 States require obedience to traffic directions by police officers.

In all jurisdictions by State law or local ordinance certain exemptions as to observance of the traffic rules are granted police and fire department and other emergency vehicles when answering emergency calls.

In all States either the State constitution or legislative statutes delegate some measure of authority to municipalities, and in many

States municipalities by reason of constitutional provisions may exercise such extensive authority in traffic matters that desirable uniformity can be obtained only through the adoption of the Model Traffic Ordinance containing numerous usual State law provisions.

Act V, ARTICLE III—TRAFFIC SIGNS, SIGNALS, AND MARKINGS

The State highway authority is required to adopt a manual and specifications for a uniform system of traffic-control devices and the State and local highway authorities in their respective jurisdictions are authorized to place and maintain all traffic-control devices conforming with the manual as deemed necessary to carry out the traffic laws or to regulate, warn, or guide traffic.

Obedience to official traffic-control devices is required, while interference with such official traffic-control devices and the display of unauthorized signs, signals, or markings are prohibited.

The text includes the traffic-control-signal legend naming the colors to be used and the positive directions of red, yellow, and green, and the words "stop, caution, and go."

In all of the States the State highway agency is authorized to place and maintain traffic signs and other traffic-control devices. Reference to a uniform manual appears in the laws of 27 States, while 24 States prescribe to a greater or less degree the meaning of traffic-control signals.

In this report following the appendices table 7 lists those States whose traffic laws include a traffic-control-signal legend.

Act V, ARTICLE IV—ACCIDENTS

The text includes a number of sections directing motorists to stop in the event of an accident, to render aid when requested, and to report traffic accidents. Failure to stop in the event of personal injury or death is punishable as a felony, while failure to stop in the event of property damage only is punishable as a misdemeanor.

Motorists involved in accidents resulting in injury to or death of any person are required to give immediate notice, either verbal or written, by the quickest means of communication, to the local police department if the accident occurs within a municipality, otherwise, to the office of the county sheriff or the nearest office of the State highway patrol. These immediate reports are required in order that the State or police authorities may without delay investigate such accidents and determine the responsibility of those involved. In addition, the driver of a vehicle involved in an accident resulting in injury to or death of any person, or total property damage to an apparent extent of \$25 or more, is required within 5 days after the accident to forward a written report of it to the State department.

If a driver involved in an accident is physically incapable of making immediate report, an occupant of the vehicle must do so. The owner of the vehicle, if not the driver, must make the written report if the driver is physically incapable of doing so.

Such written reports must be made upon forms provided by the State department of motor vehicles and shall set forth sufficiently detailed information to disclose with reference to the accident the cause, the conditions then existing, and the persons and vehicle or vehicles involved. These written reports are required primarily for statistical purposes and to permit the public authorities to determine the location and cause of traffic accidents and to permit the application of appropriate remedial measures.

It is recognized that under general principles of law a person who may be subject to criminal prosecution cannot be required to testify against himself. Thus, such written reports are for the confidential use of the department and without prejudice, except that the department may disclose the identity of a person involved in an accident when such identity is not otherwise known, or when such person denies his presence at such accident.

In any civil or criminal trial arising out of an accident the report made by a person involved shall not be used as evidence, except that anyone charged with failing to make a report may prove compliance with the statutory requirements.

Additional reports with reference to traffic accidents shall be made by law enforcement officers investigating the same, by coroners, and by persons in charge of garages or repair shops to which is brought any motor vehicle which shows evidence of having been involved in an accident for which report is otherwise required, or in respect to any vehicle which shows evidence of having been struck by a bullet.

The department is required to tabulate and analyze accident reports and to publish annually or at more frequent intervals statistical information based thereon as to the number and circumstances of traffic accidents.

Incorporated cities may by ordinance require that the driver of a vehicle involved in an accident shall also file with the designated city department a report of such accident or a copy of any report required to be filed with the State department.

Uniformity in State laws requiring reporting of accidents is essential in order that every motorist, wherever he may be driving, shall know and be able to comply with the specific requirements. If a particular State does not adopt the uniform requirements, a citizen of that State when driving in another State may neglect the require-

ments therin without at all realizing that he is subject to prosecution for misdemeanor in reference to accidents involving property damage only, and is subject to prosecution for felony in the event the accident results in injury or death to any person.

The traffic laws of every State require a motorist to stop in the event of an accident. It is specifically provided in every State that the driver of a motor vehicle involved in an accident resulting in death or personal injury must stop and return to the scene of the accident. In 37 States, such driver is specifically required to render reasonable assistance to anyone injured, and to transport the injured person to a physician or hospital if that be necessary. In all States, with the exception of Alabama and Ohio, a motorist involved in a traffic accident resulting in death or personal injury must make a written report thereof, although there are numerous variances as to the time within which such report shall be made and to what public agency. All but five States require reports of accidents resulting in property damage only, exceeding certain amounts, generally \$25 or \$50.

It is recommended that the State laws be revised to conform with specific requirements in Act V in order that every motorist when driving elsewhere than in his home State may know exactly the requirements to which he is subject. In this report, tables 2 and 3 give further detailed information concerning the laws of the various States applicable in case of accident, and indicate the discrepancies and variances in such laws.

ACT V, ARTICLE V—NEGLIGENT HOMICIDE, DRIVING WHILE INTOXICATED, AND RECKLESS DRIVING

It is of the utmost importance that State vehicle codes shall include appropriate and substantially uniform provisions defining and imposing severe penalties for the serious offenses covered in this Article. Experience in many States has demonstrated the difficulty of obtaining convictions on charges of manslaughter arising out of traffic accident deaths. Thus, the Uniform Code defines negligent homicide and prescribes penalties which are severe, but less than those ordinarily imposed upon conviction of manslaughter.

The legislatures of 19 States have defined a special crime, usually called negligent homicide, applicable to traffic accident deaths, although the majority of States still depend upon statutory provisions relating to manslaughter.

The Uniform Vehicle Code declares it unlawful for any person who is an habitual user of narcotic drugs, or any person who is under the influence of intoxicating liquor or narcotic drugs, to drive or be in actual physical control of any vehicle, and severe penalties are

prescribed for violations. The text of the Uniform Code declares that certain presumptions shall arise based on determination as to the amount of alcohol by weight in the blood of the person charged with driving under the influence of intoxicating liquor. These provisions are based on scientific studies which have been made as to the effect of drinking alcoholic beverages on the ability to operate motor vehicles safely.

The laws of every State make the operation of a motor vehicle by one in an intoxicated condition, or while under the influence of liquor, a criminal offense, although there is considerable variance in the statutory provisions and only a few States have included in their vehicle laws the recognized standard method of determining whether the driver of a vehicle is under the influence of intoxicating liquor to a degree which renders him incapable of safely driving a vehicle.

In all States, except Massachusetts, it is a penal offense to operate a motor vehicle while under the influence of drugs.

The Uniform Vehicle Code provides that:

Any person who drives any vehicle in willful or wanton disregard for the safety of persons or property is guilty of reckless driving.

The penalties that may be imposed upon conviction of reckless driving are far more severe than those that may be imposed for violation of other traffic rules of the road. Obviously it is intended that those drivers who by their conduct demonstrate that they have knowingly and intentionally operated with disregard for the safety of persons or property shall be subject to prosecution for reckless driving. Thus, the offense relates to criminal, reckless conduct rather than ordinary or simple negligence in the operation of a motor vehicle.

Any person convicted of reckless driving is subject to the suspension or revocation of his driving license by the department, as set forth in Act II of the Uniform Code. Also, in Act II the department is authorized to suspend or revoke the license of any resident or nonresident upon receiving notice of the conviction of such person in another State of an offense which would be grounds for the suspension or revocation of the license of an operator or chauffeur in the State enacting such provisions.

Thus, in order that uniform and reciprocal action may be taken by way of suspensions and revocations, it is most important that each State enact the Uniform Code section defining reckless driving and prescribing the penalties applicable upon conviction.

The motor-vehicle laws in at least 40 States define reckless driving and declare substantial penalties. However, there is considerable variance in such definitions. The majority of these States so define reckless driving as to mean something more than simple negligence,

while six States define the offense in general terms and then particularize, either by setting forth a more or less complete category of bad driving practices which shall constitute reckless driving, or by enumerating certain rules of the road nonobservance of which is declared to constitute reckless driving.

Such enumerations include offenses which do not in all instances involve actual hazard and in this respect do not conform with the concept or definition of reckless driving in Act V.

ACT V, ARTICLE VI—SPEED RESTRICTIONS

Uniformity in State speed regulations is most desirable in order that motorists driving outside of their home States may know the regulations applicable in rural areas and in business or residential districts, except as special speed zones may be indicated by appropriate signs.

The Uniform Vehicle Code in a series of sections deals comprehensively with all phases and details of speed regulations. The basic rule is declared that no person shall drive a vehicle on a highway at a speed greater than is reasonable and prudent under the conditions and having regard to the actual and potential hazards then existing.

A modified statement of the "assured clear course rule" is then stated as follows:

In every event speed shall be so controlled as may be necessary to avoid colliding with any person, vehicle, or other conveyance on or entering the highway in compliance with legal requirements and the duty of all persons to use due care.

The driver of a motor vehicle cannot be required to guarantee in every event that he will not collide with any other person or vehicle on the highway, for the reason that improper and reckless conduct by a pedestrian or another motorist may be the sole cause of a collision. Thus, the statement of the assured clear course rule recognizes the obligation of other persons using the highway to comply with legal requirements and to exercise due care.

The Uniform Code then sets forth certain *prima facie* limits as follows:

1. Twenty-five miles per hour in any business or residence district.
2. Fifty miles per hour in other locations during the daytime.
3. Forty-five miles per hour in such other locations during the nighttime.

The meaning of the term "*prima facie*" is given statutory significance and definition by declaring that the speed of any vehicle in compliance with the basic rule and not in excess of the *prima facie* limits shall be lawful, but any speed in excess of the *prima facie* limits

shall be presumed to be unreasonable and imprudent and, therefore, unlawful.

During many years a large number of States have enacted *prima facie* speed limits and the meaning and proper application of this legal term is becoming increasingly a matter of common knowledge on the part of motorists and enforcement and judicial officers.

The Uniform Code requires appropriate reduced speed when approaching and crossing an intersection or railroad grade crossing, when going around curves or approaching hill crests, when traveling upon any narrow or winding roadway, and when any other special hazard exists with respect to pedestrians or other traffic, or by reason of highway conditions. The Uniform Code recognizes that it is impossible by general State law to specify precisely the appropriate speed under the conditions as above stated, as conditions may vary even at given locations. However, the Uniform Code contains a series of sections authorizing the State authorities, after engineering and traffic investigation, to establish special speed zones upon highways under State jurisdiction, such special speed restrictions therein to be applicable when signs are erected giving notice thereof.

Likewise, and subject to similar requirements for investigation and the posting of signs, local authorities may indicate reduced speeds at intersections or may increase the usual 25 miles per hour *prima facie* limit in business or residence districts, or may reduce the usual *prima facie* speed permitted upon any rural highway within city limits.

The text also includes a minimum speed regulation to the effect that,

No person shall drive a motor vehicle at such a slow speed as to impede or block the normal and reasonable movement of traffic, except when reduced speed is necessary for safe operation or in compliance with law.

Police officers are specifically authorized to enforce this provision.

State highway authorities are also authorized to establish reduced speed limits on bridges or other elevated structures. All persons shall be subject to the speed regulations as set forth above, except any person operating an authorized emergency vehicle under the conditions specified in the Act.

A review of the State traffic laws governing speed discloses that three distinctive types of speed laws are in effect in the United States. Included in the Appendix to this report are tables 5 and 6 which show the speed laws in the 48 States. An examination of these tables discloses that the laws in 13 States do not declare any speed limits in miles per hour in rural areas, but rely entirely upon statement of a basic rule that speed shall be reasonable and prudent under the conditions.

An additional 13 States specify absolute maximum speeds in rural areas, which range from 40 miles per hour in one State to 60 miles

per hour in three States. One State has a *prima facie* limit in rural areas of 45 miles per hour and a maximum limit of 60 miles per hour. The remaining 21 States have adopted *prima facie* limits, usually 50, 55, or 60 miles per hour, although a few enacted special wartime limits of 30 or 35 miles per hour, some but not all of which have since been revised.

Practically everyone admits that thus far no completely satisfactory law governing speeds has been devised. Objection is made to maximum speed laws in rural areas on the ground that it is impossible to fix an entirely satisfactory maximum. The fact that a maximum is declared serves as an invitation to drive at such speed, even when conditions would require reduced speed in the interest of safety.

On the other hand, if a maximum speed is lower than appears reasonable to the majority of motorists, it will be disregarded.

Objection may be raised in respect to reliance entirely on a basic rule without any legal indication as to what speed in miles per hour will be regarded as creating a presumption that it is unreasonable and imprudent. The absence of any speed limitation expressed in miles per hour leaves altogether too much to the judgment of individual drivers and places too great a burden on enforcement officers in attempting to enforce the speed regulations. Therefore, the Uniform Vehicle Code and the largest group of States have adopted the general principle of *prima facie* limits.

The State traffic laws are not uniform as to the type of speed law, or the miles per hour indicated in business or residence districts, although there is an approximation to certain limitations. For example, the speeds indicated for business districts vary from 15 miles per hour to 30 miles per hour, while the speeds indicated for residence districts vary from 20 miles per hour to 35 miles per hour.

It is our opinion that the State speed laws should be revised to conform with the Uniform Code provisions and that any special or local conditions should be met by establishing special zones after engineering and traffic investigations, all such zones to be clearly indicated by appropriate signs.

ACT V, ARTICLES VII TO IX, INCLUSIVE

Article VII includes numerous rules of the road relating to driving on the right side of roadways and exceptions thereto; overtaking and passing on the left and limitations applicable; when overtaking on the right is permitted; driving on roadways laned for traffic; driving on divided highways, and restrictions on the use of limited access roadways.

These regulations are descriptive of the highway conditions to

which they apply, both in urban and rural areas. For example, driving to the left of the center of a highway is prohibited when approaching the crest of a grade, or on a curve where the driver's view is obstructed within such distance as would create a hazard to a vehicle approaching in the opposite direction; also in approaching or traversing an intersection or railroad crossing, or when the view is obstructed on approaching any bridge, viaduct, or tunnel. The foregoing prohibitions do not apply on a one-way street or roadway.

The regulations provide that the driver of a vehicle overtaking another vehicle proceeding in the same direction shall pass to the left thereof at a safe distance and shall be subject to certain additional limitations in reference to oncoming vehicles. As an exception overtaking and passing on the right is permitted only on wide streets or highways, one-way streets or roadways, or when a vehicle overtaken is making or about to make a left turn.

Article VIII includes regulations as to required positions and method of turning at intersections, which may be altered in the event local authorities require and direct that a different course be traveled in turning at intersections, as indicated by markers, buttons or signs.

The text provides that no person shall turn any vehicle without giving an appropriate signal in the manner provided if any other traffic may be affected by such movement, and no person shall stop or suddenly decrease the speed of a vehicle without first giving an appropriate signal in the manner provided to the driver of any vehicle immediately to the rear when there is opportunity to give such signal. The signal may be given either by means of the hand and arm, or in the alternative, by signal lamp or lamps or by a mechanical signal device of a type approved by the department, except that when a vehicle is so constructed or loaded that a hand and arm signal would not be visible both to the front and rear of such vehicle, then the signal must be given by such a lamp or lamps or signal device.

As will be observed upon examining table 4 the laws of 25 States prescribe the three-way hand and arm signal, as set forth in the Uniform Code, while 11 other States prescribe such three-way signals, but subject to slight variations. The laws of 9 States require hand and arm signals which do not conform with the Uniform Code, and the laws of 4 States either do not require or do not specify the method of giving hand and arm signals.

In Article IX the right-of-way rules are set forth, applicable respectively to vehicles approaching or entering intersections, to vehicles turning left at intersections, to vehicles entering through highways or stop intersections, and to vehicles entering a public highway from a private road or driveway.

The Uniform Code in Act V and the traffic laws in a majority of the States require that right-of-way shall be granted to an authorized emergency vehicle traveling in an emergency when equipped with a red light visible from the front and when audible signal is given by a siren, exhaust whistle, or bell.

ACT V, ARTICLE X—PEDESTRIANS' RIGHTS AND DUTIES

Motorists are required to yield to pedestrians crossing a roadway in a marked or unmarked crosswalk, subject to special regulations at traffic controlled intersections. Pedestrians are subject to special limitations when crossing at places other than intersections, and when walking along a roadway where sidewalks are not in place pedestrians shall when practicable walk only on the left side of the roadway or its shoulder, facing traffic approaching from the opposite direction.

The text declares that no person shall stand in a roadway for the purpose of soliciting a ride from the driver of any vehicle. The State law provisions on this latter point are tabulated in table 1. Table 7 lists the State law provisions, so far as they can be ascertained from the text of State vehicle codes, in reference to required pedestrian obedience to traffic signals and the right-of-way of pedestrians in crosswalks.

ACT V, ARTICLE XI—OPERATION OF BICYCLES AND PLAY VEHICLES

In the revision of Act V in 1944, Article XI was included relative to the operation of bicycles and play vehicles. Persons riding bicycles upon a roadway are granted all of the rights and are made subject to all of the duties applicable to the driver of a vehicle by Act V, except as to special regulations and except as to those provisions of the law which by their nature can have no application.

Ordinarily this subject is dealt with in city traffic ordinances, and the Model Traffic Ordinance contains more detailed provisions relative to bicycles, including the registration of bicycles with local authorities.

ACT V, ARTICLE XII—STREET CARS AND SAFETY ZONES

This article prohibits passing a street car on the left, except when so directed by a police officer or when on a one-way street or a street where the tracks are so located as to prevent compliance with the section.

The driver of a vehicle, when overtaking a street car on the right which has stopped or is about to stop for the purpose of receiving or discharging any passenger, shall stop such vehicle at least 5 feet to

the rear of the nearest running board or door of the street car and remain standing until passengers have alighted or boarded, except that where a safety zone has been established, the vehicle need not be brought to a stop, but may pass the street car at a speed not greater than is reasonable and proper and with due caution for the safety of pedestrians.

The State laws in a substantial number of States impose similar restrictions, although the subject of passing street cars is more commonly dealt with in municipal traffic ordinances.

ACT V, ARTICLES XIII TO XV, INCLUSIVE

The regulations in Article XIII require obedience to signals or crossing gates indicating the approach of trains, authorize State and local authorities to erect stop signs at particularly dangerous highway grade crossings of railroads, and require certain types of vehicles, including vehicles carrying passengers for hire, school busses, and vehicles carrying explosive substances or flammable liquids as a cargo or part of a cargo, to stop at all railroad grade crossings. Additional precautionary measures must be observed at railroad grade crossings by any persons operating certain types of tractors or equipment of slow operating speed or with less than normal clearance above the roadway.

Drivers of vehicles are also required to stop at through highways or intersections when protected by stop signs.

Article XIV prohibits stopping, standing, or parking in certain enumerated places, as deemed applicable State-wide, although the text makes no attempt to cover the entire field of parking regulations, which is left, in the main, to local regulations.

Article XV includes numerous other rules of the road such as required stop when overtaking and passing a school bus from either direction in rural areas when the school bus has stopped on the highway for the purpose of receiving or discharging school children.

In table 1, the requirements in reference to stopping for a school bus are tabulated. This table shows that the laws in 37 States require that vehicles shall stop under the conditions above stated. One State requires that the stop shall be made if the vehicle is proceeding in the same direction as the school bus, while two States require that the vehicle stop if on the side of the school bus where children are boarding or alighting. The laws of eight States require that vehicles shall slow down to a specified speed, generally 10 miles per hour. The traffic laws in four States apparently contain no provision in reference to stopping in rural areas when overtaking or passing a school bus which has stopped for the purpose of permitting children to board or alight.

By reason of the very large number of sections included in Articles VII to XV, inclusive, no attempt has been made in this report to analyze or present each regulation separately. Also, in respect to these regulations, there has not been opportunity to examine critically the laws of every State as to compliance, except for the subjects dealt with in the tables as mentioned.

In general, the 22 States which have adopted Act V have included practically all of its provisions, though unfortunately some States have varied the text of some of the regulations. Other States which have not adopted Act V in its entirety have included many of the rules of the road, in some instances in the exact language of Act V; while other States have indulged in some variance as to language.

This report has emphasized the need for exact textual uniformity in respect to the rules of the road, and it is suggested that the National Committee on Uniform Traffic Laws and Ordinances periodically examine the State traffic codes and city traffic ordinances and compare them with Act V of the Uniform Vehicle Code and the Model Traffic Ordinance.

Most assuredly every effort should be made to persuade those States which have not thus far conformed to enact verbatim the regulations in those parts of Act V.

ACT V, ARTICLE XVI—EQUIPMENT

Since the original preparation of the Uniform Code in 1925-26, Article XVI in Act V has been revised from time to time to keep pace with developments in headlamps and other lamps on vehicles, in respect to the performance ability of brakes, and in respect to other items of vehicle equipment.

The present text declares it a misdemeanor for any person to drive or move, or for the owner to cause or knowingly permit to be driven or moved, on any highway any vehicle or combination of vehicles which is in such unsafe condition as to endanger any person, or which does not contain those parts or is not at all times equipped with such lamps and other equipment in proper condition and adjustment as required in the article, or which is equipped in any manner in violation of the article, or for any person to do any act forbidden, or fail to perform any act required by the article.

The display of headlamps, tail lamps, and other specified lamps is required during nighttime as defined, and at any other time when there is not sufficient light to render clearly discernible persons and vehicles on the highway at a distance of 500 feet ahead. The text includes detailed provisions governing additional lamp equipment required on certain vehicles, lamps or flags on projecting loads, spot

lamps, auxiliary driving lamps, signal lamps and signal devices, reflectors and additional permissible lighting equipment.

The regulations permit the use of and impose limitations upon multiple-beam and single-beam road lighting equipment. All such lamp equipment is subject to test and approval by the commissioner before sale or use.

Other requirements and limitations apply to brakes, horns, and warning devices, mufflers, mirrors, windshields, safety glass, tire equipment, and the carrying of flares or other special warning devices by certain types of vehicles.

Our survey of the State traffic laws discloses that the majority of the 22 States classified on page 18 as having adopted Act V have incorporated modern equipment provisions substantially as set forth in Article XVI of Act V of the Uniform Code. Various other States have modernized their laws to a certain extent by making provision for multiple-beam road lighting equipment, and practically all States require test and approval of lighting equipment.

It has not been practicable to make a detailed analysis of each and all of the equipment provisions in all of the State laws, and it is recommended that such study and analysis be made by the National Committee on Uniform Traffic Laws and Ordinances.

As heretofore emphasized, identical textual uniformity in the laws of the several States in reference to equipment is of the utmost importance, not only in providing adequate standards in the interests of safe operation of motor vehicles, but also in order that a motorist, whatever his home State, may operate freely in other States in full compliance with the laws governing equipment on motor vehicles.

Act V, ARTICLE XVII—INSPECTION OF VEHICLES

This Article authorizes the commissioner to require periodical inspection of motor vehicles, trailers, and semi-trailers. The commissioner may establish permanent or temporary inspection stations of the department, or may appoint official inspection stations.

Owners and drivers are required to comply with the inspection laws. Table 1 shows that periodical inspection of vehicles is required by State law in 15 States and by city ordinance in 8 States. One State that passed an inspection law in 1947 repealed it this year.

The traffic laws in 26 States do not require periodical inspection, although in some of these States, as for example California and West Virginia, the State highway patrols hold tests unannounced from time to time on the highways, or regularly give citations for defective condition of equipment.

ACT V, ARTICLE XVIII—SIZE, WEIGHT, AND LOAD

Existing legislation regulating the maximum permissible sizes, weights, and speeds of motor vehicles is characterized by a pronounced lack of uniformity at the State level and is frequently further confused by the existence of more restrictive limitations at local levels. Table 8, State Motor Vehicle Size and Weight Limits,¹ attests to the considerable need for more uniform standards of motor vehicle sizes and weights.

The adoption by all States of uniform standards governing the maximum dimensions, weights, and speeds of motor vehicles operating over the highways is considered necessary for the following reasons:

1. To establish one of the fundamental prerequisites of highway design.
2. To promote efficiency in the interstate operation of motor vehicles.
3. To promote the safety of highway transportation.
4. To establish a present basis for regulation of the many relationships between the dimensions and weights of motor vehicles and the strengths and capacities of existing highways.

The direct primary concern of the Conference is with the safety of highway transportation.

Act V as revised in 1948 includes in Article XVIII recommended provisions governing size, weight and loading of vehicles which conform with the recommendations of the American Association of State Highway Officials and the Public Roads Administration, except that both of these agencies have sanctioned a length limit of 60 feet in respect to the total length limit of a combination of vehicles which includes a full trailer.

Act II—Uniform Motor Vehicle Operators' and Chauffeurs' License Act

It would be necessary to read the entire text of Act II in order fully to comprehend all of the basic standards deemed desirable in laws providing for the licensing of operators and chauffeurs. The following summary indicates the general scope of the act but the act itself should be examined to ascertain precisely what persons shall not be licensed, the standard of examination required, and the grounds upon which licenses must or may be suspended or revoked. These are an essential part of any adequate drivers' license law.

¹ Developed from an interim publication of, and supplemental information from, the National Highway Users Conference, Washington, D. C.

The act provides that no person shall drive any motor vehicle upon a highway unless licensed as an operator or chauffeur by the State motor vehicle department, except certain persons in military service, certain nonresidents licensed or permitted to operate in their home State, and persons operating any road machine, farm tractor, or implement of husbandry.

The department is specifically prohibited from issuing any license to persons under certain age limits, and to others declared by the statute to be ineligible. Provision is made for instruction permits and temporary licenses to permit actual driver training when accompanied by a licensed operator or chauffeur upon the public highways.

Applications must be on forms provided by the department, and applications of minors must be signed and verified by the parents or guardian, who are thereby made legally responsible for any negligent or willful misconduct of the minor when driving a motor vehicle on a highway. The department is required to examine every applicant and the scope of the examination is set forth in detail, except that when the act first takes effect persons who have previously operated a motor vehicle satisfactorily shall be licensed without examination.

Every such license shall contain the information required by the text and shall be carried by the licensee at all times when operating a motor vehicle, but a person who has inadvertently failed to carry his license and is charged under the section may be adjudged not guilty if he produces in court or the office of the arresting officer a license issued to him and valid at the time of his arrest.

The department is authorized to issue restricted licenses, limiting the extent to which the licensee may operate a motor vehicle.

Every operator's license shall be renewed on July 1 in the second or, in the alternative, the third year after issuance of such license, as may be determined by the State enacting the law. Every chauffeur's license shall expire July 1 each year and shall be renewable upon application and payment of the required fee.

The department is required to maintain suitable records regarding licenses issued, and those suspended or revoked. The department is also required to maintain accident reports and records of convictions in order that an individual record of each licensee, and the traffic accidents in which he has been involved, shall be readily ascertainable and available on renewal of license and at other suitable times.

Further, Act II makes mandatory the revocation of a license by the department on the conviction of the licensee of any of the following offenses:

1. Manslaughter (or negligent homicide) resulting from the operation of a motor vehicle.

2. Driving a motor vehicle while under the influence of intoxicating liquor or a narcotic drug.
3. Any felony in the commission of which a motor vehicle is used.
4. Failure to stop and render aid as required under the laws of this State in the event of a motor-vehicle accident resulting in the death or personal injury of another.
5. Perjury or the making of a false affidavit or statement under oath to the department under this act or under any other law relating to the ownership or operation of motor vehicles.
6. Conviction, or forfeiture of bail not vacated, upon three charges of reckless driving committed within a period of 12 months.

In addition, the department is authorized to suspend or revoke the license of any person upon any one of the other grounds set forth in the act.

The right of appeal to court is granted any person who has been denied a license, or whose license has been canceled, suspended, or revoked by the department, except where such action is mandatory under the provisions of the act.

The department is authorized to suspend or revoke the privilege of a nonresident operating upon the highways in like manner and for like cause as an operator's or chauffeur's license issued by the department may be suspended or revoked by the department, also authorized to suspend or revoke the license of any resident or the privilege of any nonresident to drive a motor vehicle in the State on receiving notice of the conviction of such person in another State of an offense therein which, if committed in this State, would be grounds for the suspension or revocation of the license of an operator or chauffeur.

Specific unlawful acts in the use of licenses are enumerated and subject to penalties.

It is of the utmost importance that each State adopt uniform standards in respect to the licensing of operators and chauffeurs, in order that each State may recognize and grant full privileges to nonresidents and in order that the reciprocal right of suspension and revocation as above stated will be appropriately exercised by each State.

Our survey of the licensing laws of the various States indicates that 24 States have adopted Act II, in most instances in its entirety. Only one State, South Dakota, still does not require drivers to be licensed. The remaining States have some form of law requiring the licensing of operators or chauffeurs, but these States have not adopted the standards set forth in Act II of the Uniform Vehicle Code.

In the Appendix of this report are the following tables:

Table 9.—Minimum Age for Operator's License.

Table 10.—Types of Temporary Permits Authorized.

Table 11.—Operator's License Examination Required.

Table 12.—Minimum Age for Chauffeur's License.

Table 13.—Chauffeur's License Examination Required.

Table 14.—Chauffeur's License Expiration and Renewal.

Act I—Uniform Motor Vehicle Administration, Registration, Certificate of Title, and Antitheft Act

This act makes adequate provision for the administration of the motor vehicle laws by creating a department of motor vehicles under the control of a civil executive officer, to be known as the Commissioner of Motor Vehicles. The powers and duties of the Commissioner are enumerated and provision is made for a division of highway safety and patrol and its powers and functions are specified in the text.

Act I requires the registration of, and issuance of certificates of title for, motor vehicles and other motor-driven vehicles of the type generally subject to registration laws when operated on the public highways, with certain exceptions relating to implements of husbandry, special mobile equipment, trolley buses operated from overhead trolley wires, and certain vehicles incidentally operated on highways or operated under special plates issued to qualified persons, such as motor car dealers and motor car manufacturers.

The department upon registering a vehicle shall issue a certificate of title, a registration card, and license plates. Such plates shall be displayed on the vehicle for which issued, and the registration card shall be carried in the vehicle to which it refers, or by the person driving it.

The department, upon registering each vehicle, shall keep a record thereof in suitable books or on index cards as follows:

1. Under a distinctive registration number assigned to the vehicle.
2. Alphabetically under the name of the owner.
3. Under the serial number, if available; otherwise, any other identifying number of the vehicle.
4. In the discretion of the department, in any other manner it may deem desirable.

A survey of the registration laws made at the time Act I was prepared by the National Conference committee disclosed that the laws of approximately one-half of the States provided that the registration of a vehicle expired upon a transfer by the owner, and that the remaining States provided that upon a transfer of ownership, the regis-

tration did not expire and the license plates remained with the vehicle, but the new owner was required to obtain a transfer on the records of the department of motor vehicles and also apply for a new certificate of title in those States having title laws. Thus, Act I includes alternative provisions in respect to transfers: One providing that registration expires on transfer by the owner; the other providing for permanent registration of the vehicle during the calendar year, but for application by the new owner for transfer of registration to his name and for issuance of a new certificate of title.

Act I also provides that evidence of any conditional sales contract, chattel mortgage, or other instrument creating a lien shall be filed with the department in order to give notice of any such lien on a registered vehicle.

The act permits nonresident owners of motor vehicles to operate without registration or permit, except for special provisions applicable to out-of-State vehicles operated for the transportation of persons or property for compensation or for the transportation of merchandise, and except in respect to out-of-State corporations carrying on business within the State and owning and regularly operating in such business any vehicle of a type ordinarily subject to registration.

Provision is also made for issuance of special plates to manufacturers, transporters, and dealers. Motorcar dealers and wreckers must be licensed by the department.

Special antitheft laws are included, requiring report of stolen and recovered vehicles to be filed with and appropriately indexed by the department. Penalties are declared for unlawful taking of a vehicle, receiving or transferring a stolen vehicle, injuring or tampering with a vehicle, altering or changing an engine or other number, or operating any vehicle without the manufacturer's number on the motor or the vehicle, or a number assigned by the department.

Penalties are also prescribed for any fraudulent application, the improper use of evidence of registration or any certificate of title, and for operating a motor vehicle without registration plates or registration card. The department is specifically authorized to suspend or revoke a registration in the event of fraud, in the event a registered vehicle is mechanically unsafe to be operated on the highways, and for certain other reasons as described.

The act contains an article for inclusion of registration and other fees, but the amount of such fees is left to the enacting State.

One of the major purposes of Act I is to provide appropriate means of identification of those vehicles operated upon highways in the event of violation of law or accident, or in the event such vehicle is stolen.

Therefore, the department is required to keep the records as stated above.

The provisions authorizing the issuance of certificates of title are designed to furnish satisfactory evidence of ownership. The act, as noted above, requires the recording of instruments evidencing liens and encumbrances with the department and notice of any such lien upon the certificate of title issued for the vehicle to which the lien applies. This is one of the most important provisions in Act I.

Unfortunately, the majority of State laws, even those providing for certificates of title, do not specifically require the recording of liens with the department. On the contrary, in a majority of the States chattel mortgages and other liens against motor vehicles are recorded locally, and the owner may or may not admit the existence of such liens in his application for certificate of title, although required to do so by the State law.

Thus, the certificates of title issued by many States afford no guarantee as to the nonexistence of chattel mortgages or other liens against the vehicle. This is one of the most serious deficiencies in the certificate of title and registration laws of the several States. Each State desires to accord full faith and credit to certificates of title issued in other States, but this will not be practicable, nor will innocent purchasers be protected, unless and until all of the States enact uniform requirements in regard to certificates of title, requiring in every instance that any chattel mortgage or other lien, except a lien dependent upon possession, shall be filed or that a copy of the instrument shall be filed with the department.

The burden of such filing should be upon the person claiming the lien, and failure to make such filing should constitute failure to give due notice of the existence of such lien.

Every State requires the registration of motor vehicles, trailers, and semitrailers, and some additional types of vehicles.

Table 1 shows that 31 States provide for issuance of certificates of title, while 18 do not so provide.

The majority of State laws, either in the vehicle codes or general statutes, impose penalties for theft or embezzlement of vehicles, or injuring or tampering with vehicles.

A limited number of States require the licensing of motor-car dealers and wreckers.

All State vehicle codes grant to nonresidents operating private passenger vehicles properly registered in the home State of the owner the privilege of operating without payment of fees for specified periods which vary in the several States. Approximately 28 States grant reciprocal privileges in respect to nonresidents operating private

passenger cars on their highways. Generally, the State laws grant very limited or no privileges to commercial vehicles, and such provisions vary widely. The failure of most States to grant reasonable privileges to nonresident commercial vehicles without payment of fees results in substantial interference with commercial transportation by motor vehicles across State lines.

Act III—Uniform Motor Vehicle Civil Liability Act

Following definitions, Act III in Section 6 establishes a statutory liability upon the part of the State, every county, incorporated city, and other public corporations for civil damages on account of personal injuries or property damage resulting from the operation of a motor vehicle by any officer, agent, or employee of the public entity when acting within the scope of his office, agency, or employment.

It would require a thorough search of the statutes of the several States to determine those State laws that impose this statutory liability upon the State and other governmental agencies.

The California Vehicle Code includes provisions substantially identical with the above section of Act III.

Section 7 provides that the owner of a motor vehicle is liable, subject to certain maximum amounts, for any damage to persons or property resulting from the negligent or willful misconduct of any person operating the motor vehicle of such owner with his express or implied permission. This statutory liability has been imposed in California, District of Columbia, Iowa, Michigan, New York, and Rhode Island, while statutory liability of the owner in New Jersey is limited to operation by members of his family.

A few States, including Idaho, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, North Dakota, and Pennsylvania, impose liability upon the owner if he permits the operation of his vehicle by any minor under the age of 16. Practically all other States rely on the common law doctrine that the owner is liable only for the negligence of his agent or servant in operating a motor vehicle, although many States by judicial decisions impose liability upon the owner when a vehicle is operated by a member of his family.

Section 8 provides that the owner or driver of a vehicle shall not be liable for bodily injury to or death of a guest, unless such injury or death proximately resulted from the intoxication or willful misconduct of the driver. Table 1 indicates that 28 States have enacted substantially similar statutes, while 21 have not.

Section 9 permits service of process on a nonresident in any action for damages arising out of a traffic accident and occurring within the State.

Such process may be served upon the commissioner, accompanied by a bond in the sum of \$500, conditioned that upon the failure of the plaintiff to prevail in the action, the plaintiff shall reimburse the defendant for the expenses necessarily incurred by him in defending the action. A copy of the summons and complaint shall be served upon the defendant, either by personal service wherever the defendant may be found, or by registered mail.

The foregoing section was based upon an early statute enacted in Massachusetts, the validity of which was upheld by the Supreme Court of the United States.

Table 1 shows that 48 States have enacted substantially identical measures providing for service of process on nonresidents in traffic accident cases.

Section 10 applies to owners of motor vehicles engaged in the business of renting such vehicles without drivers. It requires every such owner to submit to the commissioner proof of financial responsibility within certain maximum limits, either by evidence that he has obtained appropriate insurance policies, or that he is otherwise financially able to respond in damages within certain statutory limits.

The owner of a for-rent vehicle, whether he has given proof of financial ability as required by the statute or has failed to give such proof, is made jointly and severally liable with any person operating such vehicle for any damages caused by the negligent operation of the vehicle by or with the permission of the owner, except that no right of action is conferred upon any passenger in any such rented vehicle as against the owner.

There has not been opportunity to examine all of the vehicle codes in regard to such provisions, but it may be assumed that liability will attach to the owner of a for-rent vehicle in those States having statutes which impose liability on the owner for the negligence or willful misconduct of any person operating a vehicle with the express or implied permission of the owner.

From the foregoing, it will be observed that a substantial number of States have enacted some, but not all, of the provisions of Act III.

Act IV—Uniform Motor Vehicle Safety Responsibility Act

This act was added to the Uniform Vehicle Code in 1934, and incorporates standard requirements in respect to filing proof of financial responsibility as developed during past years and found in numerous State laws.

The commissioner shall require any person whose license has been suspended upon conviction of a traffic offense to furnish proof of financial responsibility before the license may be restored. Further,

the commissioner is required to suspend the operator's or chauffeur's license of, and the registration of any motor vehicle owned by, any person who fails to pay a traffic accident judgment within 30 days after the same becomes final.

Such suspension shall remain in effect until the judgment debtor has paid the judgment up to certain specified amounts, and has filed proof of financial responsibility. Such proof may be given either by obtaining a motor-vehicle liability policy, or policies, or by furnishing a bond, or by deposit of money or securities in the amount of \$11,000 with the commissioner.

Authority is vested in the commissioner to release such proof at any time after 3 years, provided no action on a traffic accident claim is pending and no traffic accident judgment remains outstanding, and the person involved has not been convicted within such 3-year period of any offense requiring suspension or revocation of license.

Act IV was revised in 1944 and 1948 to include additional security provisions based upon the latest enactments in New Hampshire, New York, and a few other States. These new provisions require report to the commissioner by those involved in traffic accidents in which any person is killed or injured, or in which damage to the property of any one person exceeds a specified amount. The commissioner shall within 60 days after receiving such report suspend the license of each operator and all registrations of each owner of a motor vehicle in any manner involved in the accident, unless such operator or owner, or both, shall deposit security in a sum which shall be sufficient in the judgment of the commissioner to satisfy any judgment or judgments for damages resulting from such accident as may be recovered against such operator or owner.

The act declares certain exceptions to the foregoing requirements. For example, deposit of security is not required of an operator or owner who had in effect at the time of the accident an automobile liability policy with respect to the motor vehicle involved in the accident, and such deposit of security is not required of any person qualifying as a self-insurer as defined in the act.

There are further exceptions to the requirement for deposit of security, for example, in the event of an accident where no injury or damage is caused to the person or property of any one other than such operator or owner. Exemption applies in reference to the operator and owner of a vehicle parked in conformance with legal requirements, also in the event the vehicle was being operated at the time of the accident without the owner's permission, express or implied, or in the event the vehicle was parked by a person who had been operating such motor vehicle without such permission.

The commissioner shall retain any deposit of security for a period of 1 year, unless within such time there shall be filed with him certain required releases or record of final adjudication of nonliability, or agreement for payment of damages representing an adjustment of claims as between the parties involved in the accident.

The commissioner shall place any security received by him in the custody of the State treasurer, and such deposit shall be applicable only to the payment of a judgment or judgments rendered against the person or persons on whose behalf the deposit was made for damages arising out of the accident in question in an action of law begun within a period of 1 year after the accident, or in certain events, within 1 year after the date of deposit of the security.

Provision is made for return of security to the person depositing the same in the event of judgment of nonliability or if release is obtained, or upon the expiration of 1 year, provided the commissioner shall be given reasonable evidence that there is no action pending and no judgment rendered that remains unpaid.

Revised Act IV was republished in 1945. Recommended drafting and a few substantive changes were approved by the National Committee on Uniform Traffic Laws and Ordinances in 1948. The document thus revised has not as yet been published.

Table 1 shows that 42 States have enacted financial responsibility laws, while one State, Massachusetts, enacted a compulsory automobile liability insurance act in 1927.

Table 15 is in the form of a chart analysis of the automobile liability laws of the various States, including the Massachusetts compulsory law, which analysis was published December 1, 1945, by the Association of Casualty and Surety Executives. Subsequent changes have been included in the table.

Model Traffic Ordinance

As heretofore mentioned, the committee on uniform traffic laws and ordinances during 1945 thoroughly reviewed and revised the Model Ordinance, the revised text being mimeographed during February 1946.

It is recognized that in certain States municipal traffic ordinances may legally include practically all the traffic rules of the road, while in other States municipalities are prohibited by constitutional provisions from invading the field of traffic regulations enacted by the State legislature. Therefore the Model Ordinance includes a large number of usual State law provisions which may be omitted as not

permissible by municipalities in some States, or as not needed in small cities.

It would appear advisable in this report merely to outline the general scope of the Model Traffic Ordinance. The Ordinance imposes certain enumerated duties upon the police department in the enforcement of all traffic laws and requires that motor vehicle accidents be investigated and that records of traffic violations and accidents shall be maintained. Further, the Ordinance provides for a city traffic engineer, who may be either the city engineer or an appointed officer, and the duties of such officer are enumerated in detail.

The city traffic engineer is, for example, authorized to install traffic control devices, including traffic signals which shall conform with the legend set forth in the Ordinance. Authority is granted in respect to establishing special speed zones, subject to certain limitations.

The Ordinance includes numerous usual State law provisions in harmony with Act V of the Uniform Vehicle Code relating to turning movements, and the authority to place and required obedience to turning markers or prohibited turn signs. The Ordinance includes authority to designate one-way streets, through streets, or stop intersections, and requires obedience to signs giving notice thereof.

The Ordinance includes a number of miscellaneous driving rules; also, regulations applicable in overtaking and passing street cars, which should be omitted by a municipality in which there are no street cars.

The Ordinance grants the right-of-way to pedestrians in crosswalks, but imposes limitations on pedestrians on other portions of the roadways, and requires pedestrian obedience to traffic control signals, although alternative provisions in this regard are stated.

The Ordinance includes numerous provisions relating to the method of parking and places where stopping, standing, or parking is prohibited. The city traffic engineer is authorized to designate curb loading zones, for either freight or passenger vehicles, and public carrier stands for busses and taxicabs. An entire article is devoted to regulations for bicycles.

Numerous sections relate to time limits on parking or enumeration of streets where parking is prohibited.

Provision is made for a traffic violations bureau, and the procedure prescribed upon arrest for any traffic violation.

While this outline of the Model Traffic Ordinance is very brief, it indicates the general scope of the subject matters included in the Ordinance. Previously in this report it was mentioned that the Model Ordinance was originally prepared in 1928, approved by the National Conference on Street and Highway Safety, and recommended for

adoption by municipalities. A survey of the municipal traffic ordinances in numerous cities discloses that a large number have adopted the earlier text of the Ordinance in its entirety, while other cities have adopted those portions of the Ordinance dealing only with strictly local matters, such as enforcement, authority to place and maintain traffic control devices, and local parking regulations, omitting the usual State law provisions.

Detailed information is lacking as to the extent to which the Model Traffic Ordinance has been adopted. There is need in each State for a control agency to assemble this information and promote the Ordinance. From such information as is available it appears that municipalities have made very substantial progress toward uniformity in municipal traffic regulations.

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

1. There is urgent demand and necessity for the enactment of uniform traffic laws and ordinances.
2. Those traffic laws and ordinances regulating and directing traffic movement should be uniform as to text.
3. Those State laws providing for the organization of State motor-vehicle administrative agencies, for the registration of motor vehicles and issuance of certificates of title, for the licensing of operators and chauffeurs, declaring civil liability in respect to the operation of vehicles, and for the filing of proof of financial responsibility by owners and operators of motor vehicles, should be adequate, comprehensive and uniform as to basic principles and standards.
4. Uniformity in the application of traffic laws and ordinances requires uniformity in respect to traffic signs, signals and pavement markings. Otherwise statutory uniformity will be nullified and confusion will result.
5. Uniformity in traffic laws and ordinances will serve to reduce traffic accidents involving loss of life, personal injury, and property damage.
6. It is entirely feasible to include in uniform State traffic laws adequate provisions for variance in the rules of the road to apply appropriately to differences in local conditions.
7. Uniform traffic laws and ordinances should be enacted by the several States and by municipalities, respectively, and it is not feasible or desirable that highway traffic control be centralized in the Federal Government.

8. The Uniform Vehicle Code and the Model Traffic Ordinance should serve as the basis for State and local traffic laws and ordinances.

9. During the past 20 years commendable progress has been made in the modernizing of State traffic laws based on, or in conformance with, the Uniform Vehicle Code.

This report, including analysis of State traffic laws in Appendix A and tables in Appendix D, demonstrates that a majority of the States have been mindful of the demands for uniformity and have made substantial progress in this regard. Those States which have co-operated are not confined within any one section or area of the United States, but are representative of States having metropolitan areas with large population and registration of motor vehicles, as well as smaller States predominantly agricultural in their development.

10. Progress toward uniformity with respect to standards of administration of the motor vehicle registration and drivers' license laws cannot be judged entirely on the basis of the text of the State traffic laws.

Although there are a certain number of States, including those which this report classifies in group III, which have not revised their State laws to conform with the Uniform Code, nevertheless, it is well known that in certain respects administrative rulings and procedures have resulted in standards comparable to those set forth in the Code.

It is recognized that the administration of the drivers' license law in many States, although based on inadequate statutory provisions, has resulted in disbarring from license those not qualified, and that administrators in these States exercise very complete powers with respect to the suspension and revocation of drivers' licenses. This is particularly true in the New England States.

11. The Model Traffic Ordinance has been very widely adopted by municipalities throughout the United States.

This has compensated in some measure for the failure in some States to enact all of the rules of the road from Act V of the Uniform Code.

12. The survey conducted by this committee discloses that many of the State traffic laws do not conform with the sequence of subject matters in Act V, the Uniform Act Regulating Traffic on Highways, or with other Acts of the Uniform Code.

This has rendered it extremely difficult in examining the State laws to determine the provisions thereof in reference to particular subject matters. In many instances the State traffic laws are included in a large number of miscellaneous statutes and in other instances rules of the road and registration and driver's license provisions are intermingled, resulting in confusion.

13. A large number of State traffic laws, as published in pamphlet form, are in such small type and with sections of such length and complexity that it would be impossible for traffic judges, enforcement officers, or motorists, resident or nonresident, to gain a comprehensive or accurate understanding of the traffic laws without most intensive and detailed study.

14. Many States and municipalities do not publish separately their State traffic rules of the road or their local traffic regulations, or any adequate summary thereof, although the summaries published in a number of jurisdictions serve as excellent media for exposition of the traffic laws.

15. In many States motorists have no convenient or practical means of information concerning the traffic regulations, except perhaps when charged with violations, and no opportunity for proper preparation before examination upon application for operators' or chauffeurs' licenses.

16. The enactment of uniform traffic laws and ordinances will not be effective in accomplishing the purposes intended unless appropriate publications of the motor-vehicle laws and ordinances or summaries thereof are made available, enabling traffic judges, enforcement officers, and motorists, both resident and nonresident, to ascertain readily the directives as to traffic movements in such laws and ordinances.

17. The enactment of uniform traffic laws and ordinances will not accomplish the purposes intended unless there is adequate and uniform administration and enforcement, and uniformity in judicial interpretations thereof.

This will not be accomplished unless there is adequate and uniform training of personnel engaged in administrative and enforcement activities.

18. The progressive development of highways, incorporating new elements of design, and increasing volumes of traffic, creating new and complex problems in traffic movements, lead to the conclusion that the traffic laws applicable upon the highways cannot be regarded as static, and it will be necessary from time to time to reconsider and revise Act V, the Uniform Act Regulating Traffic on Highways.

19. There is need for continued functioning of the Committee on Uniform Traffic Laws and Ordinances.

20. Whenever revision of Act V, or other Acts of the Code or the Model Traffic Ordinances is made, it will be necessary for the several States correspondingly to revise their traffic laws in order to maintain continuing uniformity in such laws throughout the United States.

21. Likewise, whenever the Model Traffic Ordinance is revised, it will be of the utmost importance that the municipalities throughout

the United States make any necessary revision in their traffic ordinances to continue basic uniformity in such municipal regulations.

22. There is need for intensive promotional work by all agencies of government, and by national and local organizations concerned with traffic movement and safety on highways in order to attain uniformity at the earliest possible date in the traffic laws of the States and municipalities.

RECOMMENDED MEASURES TO OBTAIN UNIFORMITY IN TRAFFIC REGULATIONS

Upon the basis of the findings and conclusions heretofore stated, the following recommendations are respectfully submitted.

1. That The President's Highway Safety Conference express its approval of and strongly urge the enactment of uniform State traffic laws and municipal traffic ordinances.
2. That The President's Highway Safety Conference express the urgent need for exact uniformity as to those directives applicable to traffic movements on the streets and highways as set forth in the Uniform Vehicle Code and the Model Traffic Ordinance.
3. That The President's Highway Safety Conference express its approval for adoption by the States in furtherance of uniformity, of the standards set forth in the Uniform Vehicle Code dealing with the administration of the traffic laws, the registration of vehicles, and the issuance of certificates of title therefor, the licensing of operators and chauffeurs, and the safety responsibility provisions.
4. That this Conference recommend to and urge the Governors of all States to call conferences in their respective States for the purpose of developing support for the enactment of such changes in existing motor vehicle laws as to bring about conformance with the Uniform Vehicle Code in the manner and to the extent set forth in these recommendations.
5. That this Conference recommend to and urge the governors of neighboring States to join in calling regional conferences to further the adoption of uniform traffic laws.
6. That this Conference recommend and urge that the governors of all States in messages to their respective legislative bodies recommend the enactment of measures, including amendments to existing laws, in furtherance of uniformity in State traffic laws.
7. That the governors of the several States, in determining their action in reference to legislative motor vehicle bills, be urged to consider the effect of such measures and disapprove those which depart from uniformity in declaring the rules of the road or depart from

those standards recognized as essential in the other Acts of the Uniform Vehicle Code.

In reference to the above, it is recommended that each motor-vehicle and highway commissioner should assume the responsibility of advising his governor whether those motor-vehicle legislative measures submitted to him for action conform with or depart from the text of Act V, or the standards embraced in the other Acts of the Uniform Vehicle Code.

8. That this Conference urge that the mayors or other chief administrative officers in municipalities, in messages to the legislative bodies thereof, recommend the enactment of ordinances, including amendments to existing ordinances, in order to conform with the Model Traffic Ordinance or such portions thereof as are necessary in the particular municipality.

9. That the Conference recommend uniformity in traffic signs, signals, and markings in conformance with the Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices; such uniformity to be attained by cooperative action on the part of street and highway authorities, local, State, and Federal.

10. That the Conference recommend to all agencies participating and represented the assumption by them of the responsibility of determining ways and means of creating a staff whose primary duty shall be to promote the adoption of the Uniform Vehicle Code and the Model Traffic Ordinance.

Further, that such staff develop appropriate pamphlets to explain the purposes and effects of the several Acts of the Code and the Model Traffic Ordinance, to be used in promoting the adoption of the uniform regulations.

11. That the conference emphasize the responsibility of numerous official and unofficial agencies in promoting the adoption of the Model Traffic Ordinance, with particular reference to the National Institute of Municipal Law Officers, the United States Conference of Mayors, and the American Municipal Association, together with local traffic associations, safety councils, women's clubs, motor clubs, labor organizations and local chambers of commerce.

12. That the conference recommend to the Council of State Governments and its committees on interstate cooperation and to the legislatures in the several States the following method of legislative procedure in revision of State traffic laws:

a. It is suggested that each of the legislatures, by resolution, authorize the appointment by its presiding officer of a special committee on motor vehicle legislation to function, either during the regular legislative session, or preferably, between regular sessions, for the

purpose of making a careful and detailed comparison of the State vehicle laws with the Uniform Vehicle Code, and to determine and to recommend such changes in the State vehicle laws as may be necessary to conform with the Uniform Vehicle Code.

b. That such legislative resolution authorize and direct the special legislative committee on motor vehicles to appoint an advisory committee on motor-vehicle legislation to consist of representatives of State and municipal departments concerned with motor-vehicle transportation, and representatives of unofficial agencies, such as motor car dealers, commercial vehicle associations, insurance companies, automobile finance companies, safety councils, labor associations, representatives of agriculture, motor clubs, chambers of commerce, and other suitable organizations to advise, cooperate with and assist the legislative committee.

13. That the Conference recommend that the mayor or other chief administrative officer in those cities which have not adopted the Model Traffic Ordinance assume the responsibility for the organization of a local committee, or the designation of an existing committee, to make careful and detailed comparison of their local traffic ordinances with the Model Traffic Ordinance and to determine and recommend those changes in such local regulations as may be necessary to harmonize them with the Model Traffic Ordinance.

14. That the Conference recommend that the several States, in revising their vehicle laws, adopt the Uniform Vehicle Code arrangement and sequence of subject matters as dealt with in successive articles and sections.

15. That the Conference recommend to the several States that consideration be given to publication separately of the rules of the road as set forth in Act V of the Uniform Vehicle Code, and that these publications be in such form and with such type as to facilitate the reading and understanding thereof by traffic judges, enforcement officers, and owners and operators of motor vehicles.

16. That the Conference recommend that each State publish a summary of its vehicle laws, particularly those regarding rules of the road, with illustrations of selected traffic situations and the regulations applicable thereto.

17. That the Conference recommend that each municipality publish its traffic ordinances or appropriate summaries thereof in such detail as may be necessary to enable the public to ascertain readily the local traffic regulations applicable to motorists and pedestrians.

This committee believes that the accomplishment of recommendations 14 to 17, inclusive, will prove of very great value in educational

procedures and in preparatory studies by applicants for drivers' licenses, and will enable both resident and out-of-State motorists readily to inform themselves of the traffic directives applicable to motor vehicles. It is essential that the public generally, and motorists particularly, be fully informed as to effective traffic laws in order to avoid violations due to ignorance of the regulations.

NECESSITY FOR UNIFORMITY IN INTERPRETATION, APPLICATION, AND ENFORCEMENT OF UNIFORM TRAFFIC LAWS AND ORDINANCES

The Committee on Laws and Ordinances desires to direct attention to the fact that the enactment of the Uniform Vehicle Code and Model Ordinance in each State and municipality, respectively, will not automatically result in uniform interpretation, application, or methods of enforcement.

The numerous official agencies participating in this Conference should assume responsibility in their respective fields for uniform administration, application, and enforcement of the regulations. We refer to the American Association of Motor Vehicle Administrators and its responsibility in respect to uniform administrative procedures. We refer to the responsibility of the Public Roads Administration, the American Association of State Highway Officials and city traffic engineers in reference to uniform practices in the installation and operation of traffic signs, signals, and markings. We refer to the responsibility of the International Association of Chiefs of Police, the superintendents of State highway patrols, and chiefs of police throughout the United States in developing and maintaining uniformity of interpretation and application of the traffic regulations.

The above organizations, in official conferences of their respective bodies, have approved and adopted uniform standards in various phases of traffic administration and regulation. With the adoption of these standards and recommended uniform practices goes the responsibility that each State and municipality, and the officials thereof, must assume in making them effective in their respective jurisdictions.

We wish to emphasize further that the American Bar Association, the Junior Bar Conference, and judicial councils in the several States, should assume responsibility for appropriate judicial procedures, including the principle of uniform penalties for like offenses.

We recommend to all members of this Conference appropriate consideration of this report, and others submitted, and urge that all members shall pledge their best efforts to the accomplishment of the objectives of this Conference.

Appendix

TABLES

TABLE 1.—Comparison of State laws with various provisions of Uniform Vehicle Code

| State | Certifi- cate-of- title law | Finan- cial-re- sponsi- bility law | Report- of-accid- ent law | Guest- suit law | Non- resident service- process law | Stop for school bus, rural high- way | Com- pulsory period- ical in- spec- tion | Dim- ming of head lamps re- quired | Safety glass re- quired | Passen- gers in front seat |
|---------------------------|--------------------------------------|--|------------------------------------|--------------------|--|--|---|---|----------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Uniform Vehicle Code. | Yes... | Yes... | Yes... | Yes... | Yes... | Yes... | Yes... | Yes... | Yes... | 3 |
| Alabama..... | No... | Yes... | Yes... | Yes... | Yes... | Yes... | (1) | No... | No... | 2 |
| Arizona..... | Yes... | Yes... | Yes... | No... | Yes... | Yes... | No... | No... | No... | |
| Arkansas..... | Yes... | No... | Yes... | No... | Yes... | Yes... | No... | Yes... | No... | 3 |
| California..... | Yes... | Yes... | Yes... | Yes... | Yes... | Yes... | No... | Yes... | Yes... | (2) |
| Colorado..... | Yes... | Yes... | Yes... | Yes... | Yes... | Slow... | Yes... | Yes... | Yes... | 3 |
| Connecticut..... | No... | Yes... | Yes... | No... | Yes... | Yes... | No... | Yes... | Yes... | |
| Delaware..... | Yes... | Yes... | Yes... | Yes... | Yes... | Slow... | Yes... | No... | Yes... | (2) |
| District of Columbia..... | Yes... | Yes... | Yes... | No... | Yes... | No... | Yes... | Yes... | Yes... | (2) |
| Florida..... | Yes... | Yes... | Yes... | Yes... | Yes... | No... | Yes... | No... | No... | (4) |
| Georgia..... | No... | Yes... | Yes... | No... | Yes... | Yes... | No... | Yes... | No... | 3 |
| Idaho..... | Yes... | Yes... | Yes... | Yes... | Yes... | Yes... | No... | Yes... | No... | 3 |
| Illinois..... | Yes... | Yes... | Yes... | Yes... | Yes... | Yes... | (1) | Yes... | Yes... | 3 |
| Indiana..... | Yes... | Yes... | Yes... | Yes... | Yes... | Yes... | No... | Yes... | Yes... | 3 |
| Iowa..... | No... | Yes... | Yes... | Yes... | Yes... | Yes... | (1) | Yes... | Yes... | 3 |
| Kansas..... | Yes... | Yes... | Yes... | Yes... | Yes... | Slow... | No... | Yes... | Yes... | 3 |
| Kentucky..... | No... | Yes... | Yes... | No... | Yes... | Yes... | No... | Yes... | Yes... | 3 |
| Louisiana..... | No... | No... | Yes... | No... | Yes... | Yes... | No... | Yes... | Yes... | |
| Maine..... | No... | Yes... | Yes... | No... | Yes... | Slow... | Yes... | Yes... | Yes... | |
| Maryland..... | Yes... | Yes... | Yes... | No... | Yes... | Yes... | Yes... | Yes... | Yes... | (2) |
| Massachusetts..... | No... | (4) | Yes... | No... | Yes... | Yes... | Yes... | Yes... | Yes... | (2) |
| Michigan..... | Yes... | Yes... | Yes... | Yes... | Yes... | Yes... | No... | Yes... | Yes... | (2) |
| Minnesota..... | No... | Yes... | Yes... | No... | Yes... | Yes... | (1) | Yes... | Yes... | 3 |
| Mississippi..... | No... | No... | Yes... | No... | Yes... | Yes... | Yes... | Yes... | Yes... | 3 |
| Missouri..... | Yes... | Yes... | Yes... | No... | Yes... | No... | No... | Yes... | Yes... | |
| Montana..... | Yes... | Yes... | Yes... | Yes... | Yes... | Yes... | (1) | Yes... | No... | 3 |
| Nebraska..... | Yes... | Yes... | Yes... | Yes... | Yes... | Yes... | No... | Yes... | Yes... | 3 |
| Nevada..... | Yes... | Yes... | Yes... | Yes... | Yes... | Yes... | No... | Yes... | No... | |
| New Hampshire..... | No... | Yes... | Yes... | No... | Yes... | Yes... | Yes... | No... | Yes... | (2) |
| New Jersey..... | Yes... | Yes... | Yes... | No... | Yes... | Yes... | Yes... | Yes... | Yes... | (2) |
| New Mexico..... | Yes... | Yes... | Yes... | Yes... | Yes... | Yes... | Yes... | Yes... | No... | |
| New York..... | No... | Yes... | Yes... | No... | Yes... | Yes... | No... | Yes... | Yes... | 3 |
| North Carolina..... | Yes... | Yes... | Yes... | No... | Yes... | Yes... | No... | Yes... | Yes... | |
| North Dakota..... | Yes... | Yes... | Yes... | Yes... | No... | Yes... | No... | Yes... | (2) | 3 |
| Ohio..... | Yes... | Yes... | Yes... | No... | Yes... | Yes... | No... | Yes... | Yes... | 2 |
| Oklahoma..... | Yes... | No... | Yes... | No... | Yes... | Yes... | No... | No... | No... | 3 |
| Oregon..... | Yes... | Yes... | Yes... | Yes... | Yes... | Slow... | (1) | Yes... | No... | 3 |
| Pennsylvania..... | Yes... | Yes... | Yes... | No... | Yes... | Slow... | Yes... | Yes... | Yes... | 3 |
| Rhode Island..... | No... | Yes... | Yes... | No... | Yes... | Yes... | (2) | No... | Yes... | |
| South Carolina..... | No... | No... | Yes... | Yes... | Yes... | Yes... | No... | Yes... | Yes... | |
| South Dakota..... | Yes... | Yes... | Yes... | Yes... | Yes... | No... | No... | Yes... | No... | |
| Tennessee..... | No... | Yes... | Yes... | No... | Yes... | Yes... | (1) | Yes... | (2) | |

See footnotes at end of table.

LAWS AND ORDINANCES

TABLE 1.—*Comparison of State laws with various provisions of Uniform Vehicle Code—Continued*

| State | Certif- cate-of- title law | Finan- cial-re- sponsibil- ity law | Report- of-acci- dent law | Guest- suit law | Non- resident service- process law | Stop for school bus, rural high- way | Com- pulsory peri- odical in- spec- tion | Dim- ming of head lamps re- quired | Safety glass re- quired | Passen- gers in front seat |
|--------------------|-------------------------------------|--|------------------------------------|--------------------|--|---|--|---|----------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Texas..... | Yes..... | (8) | Yes..... | Yes..... | Yes..... | Yes..... | (1) | Yes..... | Yes..... | |
| Utah..... | Yes..... | Yes..... | Yes..... | Yes..... | No..... | Slow..... | Yes..... | Yes..... | Yes..... | (2) |
| Vermont..... | No..... | Yes..... | Yes..... | Yes..... | Yes..... | Yes..... | Yes..... | No..... | Yes..... | 3 |
| Virginia..... | Yes..... | Yes..... | Yes..... | Yes..... | Yes..... | Yes..... | Yes..... | Yes..... | Yes..... | |
| Washington..... | Yes..... | Yes..... | Yes..... | Yes..... | Yes..... | Yes..... | (9) | Yes..... | Yes..... | 3 |
| West Virginia..... | Yes..... | Yes..... | Yes..... | No..... | Yes..... | No..... | No..... | Yes..... | Yes..... | 3 |
| Wisconsin..... | Yes..... | Yes..... | Yes..... | No..... | Yes..... | Slow..... | No..... | Yes..... | Yes..... | (2) |
| Wyoming..... | Yes..... | Yes..... | Yes..... | Yes..... | Yes..... | Yes..... | No..... | Yes..... | No..... | 3 |

¹ Required by cities.² Not such number as to interfere with driver.³ Covered by local ordinances.⁴ Compulsory insurance.⁵ Manufacturer's rating.⁶ Required on trucks and busses.⁷ Irregular.⁸ Required for commercial vehicles.⁹ Compulsory where inspection lanes are operating.

RECAPITULATION

Certificate of title law: Yes, 33; no, 16.

Financial responsibility law: Yes, 42; no, 5.

Compulsory insurance, 1.

Commercial vehicles only, 1.

Report-of-accident law: Yes, 48; no, 1.

Guest-suit law: Yes, 26; no, 23.

Nonresident service-of-process law; Yes, 47; no, 2.

Stop for school bus on rural highway: Yes, 37; slow, 8; no law, 4.

Compulsory periodical inspection:

By State, 14.

By cities, 8.

Irregular or limited, 2.

Not required, 25.

Dimming of head lamps required: Yes, 42; no, 7.

Safety glass required:

Yes, 34.

Required on trucks and busses, 2.

Not required, 13.

Limitations on passengers in front seat:

Not in excess of three, 22.

Not in excess of two, 2.

Not such as to interfere with driver, 10.

Manufacturer's rating, 1.

Covered by local ordinance, 2.

No statutory limitation, 12.

TABLE 2.—*Basic legal requirements for reporting motor vehicle accidents, by States*

| State | Immediate notice to police | Written report by operator | Written report by investigator | Authority to which reports must be made |
|------------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---|
| Uniform Vehicle Code, Act V. | Yes ¹ | Yes ¹ | Yes | State. |
| Alabama | No | No | No | |
| Arizona | No | Yes | No | Local. ² |
| Arkansas | No | Yes | No | State. |
| California | Yes ⁴ | Yes | No | Do. ⁵ |
| Colorado | No | Yes | Yes | Do. ³ |
| Connecticut | No | Yes | No | Do. |
| Delaware | Yes | No | Yes | Do. ⁶ |
| District of Columbia | Yes ⁷ | No | No | |
| Florida | Yes | Yes | Yes | State. |
| Georgia | No | Yes | No | Do. |
| Idaho | No | Yes | No ⁸ | Do. ⁵ |
| Illinois | No ⁹ | Yes | No | Do. |
| Indiana | Yes | Yes | Yes | Do. |
| Iowa | Yes | Yes | Yes | Local. ³ |
| Kansas | No | Yes | No | State. |
| Kentucky | No | Yes | No | Do. |
| Louisiana | No | Yes | No ¹⁰ | Do. ⁶ |
| Maine | Yes | Yes | Yes | Do. |
| Maryland | No | Yes | Yes | Do. |
| Massachusetts | No | Yes | Yes ¹⁰ | Do. |
| Michigan | Yes ¹¹ | No ¹² | Yes | Do. ¹³ |
| Minnesota | Yes | Yes | Yes | Do. |
| Mississippi | No | Yes | No | Do. |
| Missouri | Yes ⁷ | No | No | |
| Montana | Yes | Yes | Yes | State. |
| Nebraska | No | Yes | No ⁸ | Do. |
| Nevada | No | Yes | No | Local. |
| New Hampshire | No | Yes | No | State. |
| New Jersey | No | Yes | No ¹⁴ | Do. |
| New Mexico | No | Yes | No ⁸ | State. ⁵ |
| New York | Yes | Yes | Yes | Do. |
| North Carolina | No | Yes | No | Do. ⁶ |
| North Dakota | No | Yes ¹⁵ | No | Local. |
| Ohio | No | No | No | |
| Oklahoma | No | Yes | No | State. |
| Oregon | No | Yes | No | Local. ⁶ |
| Pennsylvania | No | Yes | No ⁶ | State. |
| Rhode Island | No | Yes | Yes ¹⁶ | Do. |
| South Carolina | No | Yes | No | Do. |

¹ Accident involving personal injury or death.² Accident involving personal injury or death, or apparent \$25 property damage.³ Local authorities must forward reports or copies to the State department.⁴ Fatal accidents only.⁵ In cities, operators must report to local authorities, who in turn must forward reports or copies to the State department.⁶ In Wilmington operators must report to city authorities.⁷ To person at scene of accident, or to police.⁸ Local authorities may be required to file a report when the original report is insufficient.⁹ Under local ordinances.¹⁰ Local authorities must report accidents in cities and towns.¹¹ Immediate notice required only in case of injury, death, or where the vehicle is so damaged that it cannot be driven from the scene of the accident.¹² Abbreviated report for financial responsibility purposes only.¹³ Notice must be given to nearest officer, who in turn must forward a report to the Commissioner of State Police.¹⁴ Police departments shall upon request forward to the State department copies of all reports received by them.¹⁵ Operators must report only accidents occurring in cities and towns.¹⁶ Local authorities must report serious accidents in cities and towns.

TABLE 2.—*Basic legal requirements for reporting motor vehicle accidents, by States—Continued*

| State | Immediate notice to police | Written report by operator | Written report by investigator | Authority to which reports must be made |
|---------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---|
| South Dakota | No | Yes | No ⁸ | State. ⁵ |
| Tennessee | No | Yes | No | Do. |
| Texas | No | Yes | Yes | Do. |
| Utah | Yes | Yes | Yes | Do. |
| Vermont | No | Yes | No | Do. |
| Virginia | Yes | Yes | Yes | Do. |
| Washington | No | Yes | Yes | Local. ⁷ |
| West Virginia | No | Yes | No | State. |
| Wisconsin | No | Yes | No | Do. |
| Wyoming | No | Yes | No | Do. |

⁸ Local authorities must forward reports or copies to the State department.

⁷ In cities, operators must report to local authorities, who in turn must forward reports or copies to the State department.

⁹ Local authorities may be required to file a report when the original report is insufficient.

TABLE 3.—*Kinds of motor vehicle accidents legally reportable, by States*

| State | Fatal and personal injury accidents | Accidents resulting in property damage only | Minimum damage reportable |
|----------------------|-------------------------------------|---|---------------------------|
| Uniform Vehicle Code | Yes | Yes | \$25 |
| Alabama | No | No | |
| Arizona | Yes | Yes | 50 |
| Arkansas | Yes | Yes | 50 |
| California | Yes | No | |
| Colorado | Yes | Yes | (1) |
| Connecticut | Yes | Yes | 25 |
| Delaware | Yes | Yes | 25 |
| District of Columbia | Yes | Yes | (2) |
| Florida | Yes | Yes | 50 |
| Georgia | Yes | Yes | 50 |
| Idaho | Yes | Yes | 50 |
| Illinois | Yes | Yes | 50 |
| Indiana | Yes | Yes | 50 |
| Iowa | Yes | Yes | 50 |
| Kansas | Yes | Yes | 50 |
| Kentucky | Yes | Yes | 50 |
| Louisiana | Yes | Yes | 25 |
| Maine | Yes | Yes | 50 |
| Maryland | Yes | Yes | 50 |
| Massachusetts | Yes | No | |
| Michigan | Yes | Yes ³ | (3) |
| Minnesota | Yes | Yes | 50 |
| Mississippi | Yes | Yes | 50 |
| Missouri | Yes | Yes | |
| Montana | Yes | Yes | 25 |
| Nebraska | Yes | Yes | 50 |
| Nevada | Yes | Yes | (1) |
| New Hampshire | Yes | Yes | 50 |
| New Jersey | Yes | Yes | 25 |
| New Mexico | Yes | Yes | 50 |

¹ Any amount.

² Substantial.

³ Operators must notify the police in personal injury accidents, or property damage accidents in which a vehicle is disabled so it cannot be propelled in the usual manner.

TABLE 3.—*Kinds of motor vehicle accidents legally reportable, by States—Continued*

| State | Fatal and personal injury accidents | Accidents resulting in property damage only | Minimum damage reportable |
|----------------|-------------------------------------|---|---------------------------|
| New York | Yes | Yes | \$25 |
| North Carolina | Yes | Yes | 25 |
| North Dakota | Yes | Yes | 50 |
| Ohio | No | No | |
| Oklahoma | Yes | Yes | (1) |
| Oregon | Yes | Yes | (1) |
| Pennsylvania | Yes | Yes | 50 |
| Rhode Island | Yes | Yes | 100 |
| South Carolina | Yes | Yes | 50 |
| South Dakota | Yes | Yes | 50 |
| Tennessee | Yes | Yes | 50 |
| Texas | Yes | Yes | 50 |
| Utah | Yes | Yes | 25 |
| Vermont | Yes | Yes | 35 |
| Virginia | Yes | Yes | 25 |
| Washington | Yes | Yes | 25 |
| West Virginia | Yes | No | |
| Wisconsin | Yes | Yes | 50 |
| Wyoming | Yes | Yes | 50 |

¹ Any amount.

TABLE 4.—*Comparison of State laws and Uniform Vehicle Code requirements regarding the giving of signals by hand and arm*

Act V of the Uniform Vehicle Code, see. 80, provides in the alternative that a signal when required may be given either by means of the hand and arm or by a signal lamp or device of a type approved by the department.

Section 81 provides that when a signal is given by means of the hand and arm, it shall be given from the left side of the vehicle in the following manner and such signals shall indicate as follows:

1. Left turn—hand and arm extended horizontally.
2. Right turn—hand and arm extended upward.
3. Stop or decrease speed—hand and arm extended downward.

THREE-POSITION HAND SIGNAL (OR SAME WITH VARIATIONS)

Those States first listed below provide for the three-way hand-and-arm signal as specified in Act V of the Uniform Vehicle Code but subject to the variations noted. In numerous States alternate signals may be given by a mechanical or electrical signal device.

Alabama: Stop or slow—arm waved up and down.

Arizona.

Arkansas.

California.

Colorado.

Delaware: Right turn—arm upward and moved from rear to front.

District of Columbia.

Florida.

Georgia: Left turn—arm horizontal with finger pointed.

Idaho.

Illinois: Right turn—arm upward or moved with sweeping motion from rear to front.

Indiana: Stop, slow, or halt—extend arm horizontally and move it up and down.

Iowa.

Kansas: Right turn—arm upward or moved forward with sweeping motion.

Kentucky.

Louisiana.

Maryland: Hold hand still several seconds for all signals. Stop or slow—arm downward, palm to rear.

Minnesota.

Mississippi: Right turn—arm upward or moved with sweeping motion from rear to front.

TABLE 4.—*Comparison of State laws and Uniform Vehicle Code requirements regarding the giving of signals by hand and arm—Continued*

Missouri.
 Montana.
 Nebraska.
 New Mexico.
 North Carolina: Left turn—arm horizontal, finger pointing.
 North Dakota.
 Ohio.
 Oklahoma: Left turn—arm horizontal with forefinger pointed.
 Oregon.
 South Carolina.
 South Dakota.
 Tennessee.
 Texas.
 Utah.
 Virginia.
 Washington.
 West Virginia: Slow or stop—wave hand up and down.
 Wyoming.

OTHER HAND SIGNALS, OR LACK OF REQUIREMENT FOR SAME, OR LACK OF DESCRIPTION OF SIGNAL REQUIRED

The following States differ from the Uniform Vehicle Code and provide for the giving of hand-and-arm signals as stated. In numerous States alternate signals may be given by a mechanical or electrical signal device.

Connecticut: Hand signals required.
 Left turn—hand moving up and down, pointing with finger.
 Right turn—hand rotated.
 Stop or slow—arm horizontal.
 Maine: Hand signal not required—but recommended.
 Massachusetts: Hand signals—required on State highways only but urged on all highways.
 Left turn—extend arm horizontally and point with index finger.
 Right turn—extend arm horizontally and rotate hand.
 Stop or slow—extend arm horizontally.
 Michigan: Hand signals required.
 Left arm horizontal for all maneuvers.
 Nevada: Hand signal required.
 Extend left hand to give notice of change of direction.
 New Hampshire: Hand signals not required.
 New Jersey: Hand signals required.
 Left turn—extend arm and point index finger.
 Right turn—extend arm and rotate hand from rear to front.
 Stop or slow—extend arm with palm to rear.
 New York: Hand signal required.
 Arm horizontal for all maneuvers.
 Pennsylvania: Hand signal required.
 Arm horizontal for all maneuvers.
 Rhode Island: Hand signals not required.
 Vermont: Hand signals required.
 Left turn—arm horizontal with index finger pointed.
 Right turn and slow or stop—arm horizontal.
 Wisconsin: Hand signals not required.

RECAPITULATION

| | |
|---|----|
| Number of States with hand-and-arm signals identical with Act V, Uniform Vehicle Code..... | 25 |
| Number of States with hand-and-arm signals essentially the same as Act V but with slight variation..... | 11 |
| Number of States whose hand-and-arm signals do not conform..... | 9 |
| Number of States which do not require or do not specify method of hand-and-arm signals..... | 4 |

TABLE 5.—*State speed limits for passenger automobiles*

| State | Business district | | Residence district | | Open country | | | Special limits ¹ | | |
|-----------------------|-------------------|-------------------|--------------------|-------------------|--------------|-------------|-------------------|-----------------------------|-------|-------------------|
| | Limit | Type ² | Limit | Type ³ | Day limit | Night limit | Type ² | Location | Limit | Type ³ |
| Uniform Vehicle Code. | 25 | PF-- | 25 | PF-- | 50 | 45 | PF-- | None-- | | |
| Alabama | 20 | PF-- | 25 | PF-- | (*) | (*) | | Intersections, schools. | 15 | |
| Arizona | 20 | Abs-- | 25 | Abs-- | (*) | (*) | | Schools-- | 15 | |
| Arkansas | 20 | PF-- | 25 | PF-- | 55 | | PF-- | | | |
| California | 25 | PF-- | 25 | PF-- | 55 | | PF-- | | | |
| Colorado | 25 | PF-- | 30 | PF-- | 60 | | PF-- | Mountain roads-- | 40-20 | PF. |
| Connecticut | (*) | (*) | (*) | (*) | 40 | | PF-- | | | |
| Delaware | 25 | Abs-- | 35 | Abs-- | 50 | | Abs-- | 4-lane and dual-- | | |
| District of Columbia | 25 | Abs-- | 25 | Abs-- | | | | Alleys-- | 7 | Abs. |
| Florida | 25 | PF-- | 25 | PF-- | 60 | 50 | PF-- | | | |
| Georgia | (*) | (*) | (*) | (*) | 55 | | Abs-- | | | |
| Idaho | 15-20 | PF-- | 20 | PF-- | 35 | | PF-- | Schools, obstructed view. | 15 | PF. |
| Illinois | 20 | PF-- | 25 | PF-- | (*) | (*) | | Suburban-- | 35 | PF. |
| Indiana | 20 | PF-- | 30 | PF-- | (*) | (*) | | Suburban-- | 45 | PF. |
| Iowa | 20 | Abs-- | 25 | Abs-- | (*) | (*) | | Suburban-- | | |
| Kansas | 20 | PF-- | 30 | PF-- | (*) | (*) | | | | |
| Kentucky | 20 | PF-- | 25 | PF-- | 45 | | PF-- | | | |
| Louisiana | (*) | (*) | (*) | (*) | 60 | | Abs-- | Unincorporated places. | 25 | PF. |
| Maine | 25 | PF-- | 25 | PF-- | 45 | | PF-- | | | |
| Maryland | 25-30 | Abs-- | 25-35 | Abs-- | 50-55 | | Abs-- | | | |
| Massachusetts | 20 | PF-- | 20 | PF-- | 40 | | PF-- | Obstructed view-- | 15 | PF. |
| Michigan | 25 | PF-- | 25 | PF-- | (*) | | | | | |
| Minnesota | 30 | Abs-- | 30 | Abs-- | 60 | 50 | PF-- | | | |
| Mississippi | 20-30 | PF-- | 30 | PF-- | 60 | | PF-- | | | |
| Missouri | 25 | PF-- | 25 | PF-- | 25 | | PF-- | | | |
| Montana | (*) | (*) | (*) | (*) | (*) | 55 | PF-- | | | |
| Nebraska | 20 | PF-- | 25 | PF-- | 60 | 50 | PF-- | | | |
| Nevada | (*) | (*) | (*) | (*) | (*) | | | | | |
| New Hampshire | 20 | PF-- | 25 | PF-- | (*) | | | School-- | 15 | PF. |
| New Jersey | 15-20 | Abs-- | 20 | Abs-- | 40 | | Abs-- | Special locations-- | 45 | Abs. |
| New Mexico | 20 | Abs-- | 25 | Abs-- | (*) | | | | | |
| New York | (*) | (*) | (*) | (*) | 50 | | Abs-- | | | |
| North Carolina | 20 | Abs-- | 35 | Abs-- | 55-45 | | Abs-- | | | |
| North Dakota | 25 | PF-- | 25 | PF-- | 60 | 50 | PF-- | | | |
| Ohio | 25 | PF-- | 25 | PF-- | 750 | | PF-- | Through highways-- | 35 | PF. |
| Oklahoma | (*) | (*) | (*) | (*) | (*) | (*) | | | | |
| Oregon | 20 | PF-- | 25 | PF-- | 55 | | PF-- | Public beaches-- | 25 | Abs. |
| Pennsylvania | 25-35 | Abs-- | 25-35 | Abs-- | 50 | | Abs-- | Turnpike-- | 70 | Abs. |
| Rhode Island | 20 | PF-- | 20 | PF-- | 50 | | PF-- | | | |
| South Carolina | 25 | Abs-- | 35 | Abs-- | 55 | | Abs-- | | | |
| South Dakota | 15-20 | PF-- | 30 | PF-- | 60 | 50 | Abs-- | | | |
| Tennessee | 30 | PF-- | 30 | PF-- | (*) | (*) | | | | |
| Texas | 30 | Abs-- | 30 | Abs-- | 60 | 55 | Abs-- | Suburban-- | 30 | Abs. |

¹ Provisions for modified limits by administrative authority through zoning and posting are indicated in table 6.

² PF means limits are prima facie and Abs means absolute.

³ None.

⁴ By ordinance.

⁵ Upper limit in each case applies on dual highways.

⁶ For distance of a half mile.

⁷ Departmental regulation.

TABLE 5.—*State speed limits for passenger automobiles—Continued*

| State | Business district | | Residence district | | Open country | | | Special limits ¹ | | |
|--------------------|-------------------|-------------------|--------------------|-------------------|--------------|-------------|-------------------|-----------------------------|-------|-------------------|
| | Limit | Type ² | Limit | Type ² | Day limit | Night limit | Type ² | Location | Limit | Type ² |
| Utah..... | 25 | PF..... | 25 | PF..... | 60 | 50 | PF..... | | | |
| Vermont..... | (4) | (4) | (4) | (4) | 50 | | Abs..... | | | |
| Virginia..... | 15 | Abs..... | 25 | Abs..... | 50 | | Abs..... | Certain suburbs..... | 35 | Abs..... |
| Washington..... | 20 | Abs..... | 25 | Abs..... | 50 | | Abs..... | | | |
| West Virginia..... | 20 | Abs..... | 20 | Abs..... | 50 | | Abs..... | | | |
| Wisconsin..... | 25 | Abs..... | 25 | Abs..... | (3) | (3) | | | | |
| Wyoming..... | 20 | PF..... | 30 | PF..... | 60 | | PF..... | School..... | 20 | PF..... |

¹ Provisions for modified limits by administrative authority through zoning and posting are indicated in table 6.

² PF means limits are *prima facie* and Abs means absolute.

³ None.

⁴ By ordinance.

RECAPITULATION

Prima facie limits, 26.

Absolute limits, 14.

Combination of prima facie and absolute, 5.

No open country limit (though in most cases the basic rule requiring speed reasonable and proper for the conditions), 13.

Night differential, 8.

Local jurisdictions permitted to establish limits by ordinance, 8.

TABLE 6.—*Speed-zoning provisions in the various States—power of State and local authorities to establish and post limits other than indicated in table 5*

| State | State authority | | | Local authorities | | | |
|---------------------------|------------------------|----------|---------------------|------------------------|----------------------------------|-------------------------------|---|
| | Higher | Lower | Day, night, or both | Lower at intersections | Higher than built-up area limits | Lower than open-country limit | State approval required on State highways |
| Uniform Vehicle Code..... | Yes..... | Yes..... | Yes..... | Yes..... | Yes ¹ | Yes ² | Yes..... |
| Alabama..... | | | | | Yes..... | | |
| Arizona..... | | | | | Yes..... | | |
| Arkansas..... | | | Yes..... | | Yes..... | | |
| California..... | Yes..... | Yes..... | | | Yes..... | Yes..... | Yes..... |
| Colorado..... | | Yes..... | | | Yes..... | Yes..... | |
| Connecticut..... | | | | | | | |
| Delaware..... | Yes..... | Yes..... | | | Yes..... | | |
| District of Columbia..... | Yes ³ | | | | | | |
| Florida..... | | | | | | | |
| Georgia..... | | | | | | | |
| Idaho..... | | | | | Yes..... | | |
| Illinois..... | Yes ⁴ | Yes..... | | Yes..... | Yes ⁴ | | |
| Indiana..... | Yes..... | Yes..... | | | Yes..... | Yes..... | Yes..... |
| Iowa..... | | | | | Yes..... | | |
| Kansas..... | | | | | Yes..... | Yes..... | |
| Kentucky..... | | | | | | | |
| Louisiana..... | | | | | Yes..... | | |
| Maine..... | | | | | | | |
| Maryland..... | | Yes..... | | | | | |

¹ Not to exceed 50 miles per hour in daytime or 45 in nighttime.

² Not to be less than 35 miles per hour.

³ Not to exceed 30 miles per hour.

⁴ Not to exceed 45 miles per hour.

TABLE 6.—*Speed-zoning provisions in the various States—power of State and local authorities to establish and post limits other than indicated in table 5—Con.*

| State | State authority | | | Local authorities | | | | State approval required on State highways |
|----------------|-----------------|-------|---------------------|------------------------|----------------------------------|-------------------------------|--|---|
| | Higher | Lower | Day, night, or both | Lower at intersections | Higher than built-up area limits | Lower than open-country limit | | |
| Massachusetts | Yes | Yes | Both | Yes ⁵ | Yes ⁵ | Yes ⁵ | | |
| Michigan | Yes | Yes | Yes | | Yes | Yes | | |
| Minnesota | Yes | Yes | | Yes ⁶ | | | | |
| Mississippi | | Yes | | Yes ⁸ | | | | |
| Missouri | | | | | | | | |
| Montana | | | | | | | | |
| Nebraska | | Yes | | Yes | Yes | Yes | | |
| Nevada | | | | | | | | |
| New Hampshire | | | | | | | | |
| New Jersey | | | | | | | | |
| New Mexico | | | | | | | | |
| New York | Yes | | | | | | | |
| North Carolina | | Yes | | Yes | Yes | | | |
| North Dakota | | | | | Yes | | | |
| Ohio | Yes | Yes | | | Yes | | | |
| Oklahoma | | | | | Yes | | | |
| Oregon | Yes | Yes | | | | | | |
| Pennsylvania | | | | | | | | |
| Rhode Island | | | | | | | | |
| South Carolina | | Yes | | Yes | | | | Yes |
| South Dakota | | | | | | | | |
| Tennessee | | | | | | | | |
| Texas | | Yes | | | | | | |
| Utah | Yes | Yes | | | Yes | Yes | | Yes |
| Vermont | | | Yes | | | | | |
| Virginia | | | | | | | | |
| Washington | | | | | | | | |
| West Virginia | | | | | Yes | | | |
| Wisconsin | Yes | Yes | Yes | | | Yes ⁹ | | Yes ⁹ |
| Wyoming | Yes | | | | | | | |

⁵ May establish limits in any area subject to approval of State authorities.⁶ Local authorities are limited to ways under their control.⁷ All changes subject to approval of commissioner.⁸ Not to be less than 25 miles per hour.⁹ At controlled intersections only.TABLE 7.—*Pedestrians' rights and duties in the various States*

| State | Traffic signal legend | Pedestrians on red light | | Pedestrian right-of-way in cross walk | Must walk on left on rural highway |
|------------------------------|-----------------------|--------------------------|---|---------------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| | | Must yield to vehicles | Must not proceed | | |
| Uniform Vehicle Code, Act V. | Yes, see. 34 | Yes, see. 34 | Local authorities may so require by ordinance, sec. 87. | Yes, sec. 88 | Yes, see. 92 |
| Alabama | No | | | | |
| Arizona | No | | | | |
| Arkansas | Yes | | Yes | Yes | No |
| California | Yes | | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Colorado | Yes | Yes | | Yes | Yes |
| Connecticut | Yes | | Yes | Yes | No |
| Delaware | Yes | | Yes | Yes | No |

TABLE 7.—*Pedestrians' rights and duties in the various States—Continued*

| State | Traffic signal legend | Pedestrians on red light | | Pedestrian right-of-way in cross walk | Must walk on left on rural highway |
|----------------------|-----------------------|--------------------------|------------------|---------------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| | | Must yield to vehicles | Must not proceed | | |
| District of Columbia | Yes | | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Florida | No | No | | No | No |
| Georgia | | | | Yes | Advisable |
| Idaho | No | | | | |
| Illinois | Yes | Yes | | Yes | Yes |
| Indiana | Yes | Yes | | Yes | Yes |
| Iowa | Yes | Yes | | Yes | Yes |
| Kansas | Yes | Yes | | Yes | No |
| Kentucky | No | | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Louisiana | No | No | | Yes | Yes |
| Maine | No | No law | | No law | Yes |
| Maryland | Yes | Yes | | Yes | Yes |
| Massachusetts | Yes | No law | | Yes | No law |
| Michigan | Yes | Yes | Sec. 87, Act V | No law | Yes |
| Minnesota | Yes | | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Mississippi | Yes | Yes | | Yes | No law |
| Missouri | No | No law | | No law | Do |
| Montana | No | do | | Yes | Do |
| Nebraska | No | Yes | | Yes | Do |
| Nevada | No | No law | | No law | Do |
| New Hampshire | No | do | | do | Do |
| New Jersey | Yes | | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| New Mexico | No | No law | | No law | No law |
| New York | Yes | | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| North Carolina | No | | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| North Dakota | No | Yes | | Yes | No law |
| Ohio | Yes | Yes | | Yes | Yes |
| Oklahoma | No | | | Yes | |
| Oregon | Yes | | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Pennsylvania | Yes | Yes | | Yes | No law |
| Rhode Island | Yes | No law | | Yes | Yes |
| South Carolina | No | do | | No law | Yes |
| South Dakota | No | do | | Yes | No law |
| Tennessee | No | do | | Yes | Yes |
| Texas | Yes | Yes | Sec. 87, Act V | Yes | Yes |
| Utah | Yes | Yes | | Yes | Yes |
| Vermont | No | No law | | No law | No law |
| Virginia | No | do | | Yes | Yes |
| Washington | Yes | | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| West Virginia | No | No law | | No law | Yes |
| Wisconsin | Yes | Yes | | Yes | Yes |
| Wyoming | No | | Yes | Yes | No |

TABLE 8.—*State motor-vehicle size-and-weight limits*

| State | Wldth (inches) | Height (feet) | Length | | | Axle load (pounds) | Type of gross-weight restriction |
|----------------------|----------------|---------------|--------------------|------------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------|----------------------------------|
| | | | Single unit (feet) | Tractor, semi-trailer (feet) | Other combinations (feet) | | |
| Uniform Vehicle Code | 196 | 12½ | 235 | 50 | 350 | 18,000 | Table. |
| Alabama | 96 | 12½ | 35 | 45 | NP | 18,000 | Formula. |
| Arizona | 102 | 13½ | 35 | 65 | 65 | 18,000 | Do. |
| Arkansas | 96 | 12½ | 35 | 50 | 60 | 18,000 | Table. |
| California | 96 | 13½ | 35 | 60 | 60 | 18,000 | Do. |
| Colorado | 96 | 12½ | 35 | 60 | 60 | 18,000 | Formula. |

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 8.—*State motor-vehicle size-and-weight limits*—Continued

| State | Width (inches) | Height (feet) | Length | | | Axe load (pounds) | Type of gross- weight restriction |
|----------------------|-------------------|------------------|--------------------------|--|--------------------------------------|-------------------------|---|
| | | | Single unit (feet) | Tractor, semi- trailer (feet) | Other combi- nations (feet) | | |
| Connecticut | 102 | 12½ | 45 | 45 | 4 NP | 22,400 | Specific limit. |
| Delaware | 96 | 12½ | 35 | 50 | 60 | 20,000 | Table. |
| District of Columbia | 96 | 12½ | 35 | 50 | 50 | 22,000 | Do. |
| Florida | 96 | 12½ | 35 | 50 | 50 | 18,000 | Specific limit. |
| Georgia | 96 | 13½ | 35 | 45 | 45 | 18,000 | Formula. |
| Idaho | 96 | 14 | 35 | 60 | 65 | 18,000 | Specific limit. |
| Illinois | 96 | 4 NS | 42 | 45 | 45 | 18,000 | Do. |
| Indiana | 96 | 6 13½ | 7 36 | 50 | 50 | 18,000 | Do. |
| Iowa | 96 | 12½ | 8 35 | 45 | NP | 17,000 | Do. |
| Kansas | 96 | 12½ | 35 | 45 | 45 | 18,000 | Formula. |
| Kentucky | 96 | 12½ | 35 | 45 | NP | 18,000 | Specific limit. |
| Louisiana | 96 | 12½ | 35 | 50 | 60 | 18,000 | Do. |
| Maine | 96 | 12½ | 45 | 45 | 45 | 22,000 | Table. |
| Maryland | 96 | 4 NR | 55 | 55 | 55 | 22,400 | Formula. |
| Massachusetts | 10 96 | NR | 35 | 45 | 11 NS | 22,400 | Specific limit. |
| Michigan | 12 96 | 13 12½ | 35 | 50 | 50 | 18,000 | Do. |
| Minnesota | 96 | 12½ | 40 | 45 | 45 | 18,000 | Formula. |
| Mississippi | 96 | 12½ | 35 | 45 | 45 | 18,000 | Table. |
| Missouri | 96 | 12½ | 35 | 45 | 45 | 18,000 | Formula. |
| Montana | 96 | 13½ | 8 35 | 60 | 60 | 18,000 | Table. |
| Nebraska | 96 | 12½ | 35 | 50 | 50 | 18,000 | Do. |
| Nevada | NR | NR | NR | NR | NR | 18,000 | Do. |
| New Hampshire | 96 | NR | 35 | 45 | 45 | 18,000 | Specific limit. |
| New Jersey | 96 | 12½ | 35 | 45 | 50 | Tahle | Do. |
| New Mexico | 96 | 12½ | 40 | 65 | 65 | 18,000 | Formula. |
| New York | 96 | 13 | 35 | 50 | 50 | 22,400 | Do. |
| North Carolina | 96 | 12½ | 35 | 48 | 48 | 18,000 | Specific limit. |
| North Dakota | 96 | 12½ | 35 | 45 | 45 | 18,000 | Formula. |
| Ohio | 96 | 12½ | 35 | 45 | 60 | 18,000 | Do. |
| Oklahoma | 96 | 13 12½ | 35 | 50 | 50 | 18,000 | Table. |
| Oregon | 96 | 12 | 35 | 60 | 60 | 18,000 | Do. |
| Pennsylvania | 96 | 12½ | 33 | 45 | 50 | 20,000 | Specific limit. |
| Rhode Island | 102 | 12½ | 35 | 45 | 45 | 22,400 | Do. |
| South Carolina | 96 | 12½ | 40 | 50 | 50 | 20,000 | Table. |
| South Dakota | 96 | 13 | 8 35 | 50 | 50 | 18,000 | Do. |
| Tennessee | 96 | 12½ | 35 | 45 | 45 | 18,000 | Specific limit. |
| Texas | 96 | 12½ | 35 | 45 | 45 | 18,000 | Formula. |
| Utah | 96 | 14 | 45 | 60 | 60 | 18,000 | Table. |
| Vermont | 96 | 12½ | 50 | 50 | 50 | NR | Specific limit. |
| Virginia | 96 | 12½ | 33 | 45 | 45 | 18,000 | Do. |
| Washington | 96 | 12½ | 35 | 60 | 60 | 18,000 | Table. |
| West Virginia | 96 | 12½ | 35 | 45 | 45 | 22,000 | Formula. |
| Wisconsin | 96 | 12½ | 35 | 45 | 45 | 19,000 | Do. |
| Wyoming | 96 | 12½ | 40 | 60 | 60 | 18,000 | Table. |

¹ Busses and trackless trolley coaches 102 inches wide permissible in municipalities by ordinance, and in adjacent suburban areas on routes with 12-foot traffic lanes.

² 3-axle busses or trackless trolley coaches may be 40 feet.

³ Poles, pipes, or structural material which cannot be dismembered may be up to 80 feet.

⁴ NP—not permitted; NR—not restricted; NS—not specified.

⁵ Trackless trolley coaches may be 40 feet, or 50 feet if articulated.

⁶ Without load, 12½ feet.

⁷ Common-carrier busses 40 feet long may operate on State highways at least 20 feet wide.

⁸ 3-axle busses may be 40 feet.

⁹ Trailers hauling firewood, pulpwood, or logs may be 102 inches wide.

¹⁰ May be exceeded only by projection of pneumatic tires beyond rims, but not to exceed 102 inches.

¹¹ No more than 1 trailer or other vehicle may be drawn behind a motor vehicle.

¹² Trailers hauling forest products may be 104 inches wide.

¹³ Height of vehicles designed to transport other vehicles must not with load exceed 13½ feet in Michigan, 13 feet in Oklahoma.

TABLE 9.—*Minimum age for operator's license in the various States and Hawaii*

| State | Minimum age (years) | Exceptions |
|--|---------------------|---|
| Uniform Vehicle Code, Act. II, see. 10 | 16 | Restricted license 14 and 15. |
| Alabama | 16 | |
| Arizona | 18 | Permit 16 and 17 upon request of parent or guardian. |
| Arkansas | 16 | Junior permit 14 and 15. |
| California | 16 | Junior permit 14 and 15 issued under special conditions. |
| Colorado | 16 | |
| Connecticut | 16 | |
| Delaware | 16 | |
| District of Columbia | 18 | Junior permit 16 and 17 with written consent of parent or guardian. |
| Florida | 16 | Restricted license 14 and 15. |
| Georgia | 16 | |
| Hawaii | 15 | |
| Idaho | 16 | Do. |
| Illinois | 15 | License under 18 only with consent of parent or guardian. |
| Indiana | 16 | Beginner license issued to persons over 16 and under 18. Persons over 18 who have operated a motor vehicle less than 1 year may operate for 6 months when accompanied by a licensed driver; may take examination for operator's license after 30 days have expired. |
| Iowa | 16 | Restricted license 14 and 15. |
| Kansas | 16 | Do. |
| Kentucky | 18 | Junior permit 16 and 17. |
| Louisiana | 14 | |
| Maine | 15 | |
| Maryland | 16 | Persons between the ages of 14 and 16 years may obtain license to operate a bicycle with motor attachment or a motor scooter. |
| Massachusetts | 16 | |
| Michigan | 16 | Restricted license 14 and 15. |
| Minnesota | 15 | |
| Mississippi | 17 | Junior permit 15 and 16 (to drive school bus 17). |
| Missouri | 16 | |
| Montana | 15 | Junior permit 14. |
| Nebraska | 16 | Junior permit 14 and 15 in special cases. |
| Nevada | 16 | Restricted permit 14 and 15. |
| New Hampshire | 16 | |
| New Jersey | 17 | Restricted permit 16. |
| New Mexico | 14 | |
| New York | 18 | Junior permit 16 and 17. |
| North Carolina | 16 | All licenses under 18 must be signed by parent or guardian. |
| North Dakota | 16 | Junior permit 14 and 15. |
| Ohio | 16 | Restricted license 14 and 15. |
| Oklahoma | 16 | Junior school permit 14 and 15. |
| Oregon | 16 | Junior permit 14 and 15. |
| Pennsylvania | 18 | Junior permit 16 and 17. |
| Rhode Island | 16 | |
| South Carolina | 14 | |
| South Dakota | 15 | No operator's license issued. |
| Tennessee | 16 | Junior permit 14 and 15. |
| Texas | 16 | County judge may authorize issuance to any person over 14 if condition exists which makes it necessary. |
| Utah | 16 | |
| Vermont | 18 | Junior permit 16 and 17. |
| Virginia | 16 | Junior permit 14 and 15. |
| Washington | 16 | Under age of 16 limited permit to operate within a restricted farming locality. |
| West Virginia | 16 | |
| Wisconsin | 16 | Junior permit 14 and 15, restricted, cannot operate in any county in State having a population of 500,000 or more. |
| Wyoming | 15 | No operator's license issued. |

TABLE 10.—*Types of temporary permits authorized by the various States*

| State | Instruction, beginner's, or learner's permit ¹ | Temporary, pending completion of investigation ² | State | Instruction, beginner's, or learner's permit ¹ | Temporary, pending completion of investigation ² |
|-------------------------------|---|---|----------------|---|---|
| Uniform Vehicle Code, Act II. | Yes, sec. 12 (a). | Yes, sec. 12 (c). | Montana | Yes | Yes. |
| Alabama | Yes | No | Nebraska | No | No. |
| Arizona | Yes | No | Nevada | Yes | Yes. |
| Arkansas | Yes | Yes | New Hampshire | No | No. |
| California | Yes | Yes | New Jersey | Yes | No. |
| Colorado | Yes | Yes | New Mexico | No | |
| Connecticut | Yes | No | New York | Yes | |
| Delaware | Yes | No | North Carolina | No ³ | |
| District of Columbia | Yes | Yes | North Dakota | No | |
| Florida | Yes | | Ohio | Yes | No. |
| Georgia | Yes | | Oklahoma | Yes | No. |
| Idaho | Yes | Yes | Oregon | Yes | No. |
| Illinois | Yes | No | Pennsylvania | Yes | No. |
| Indiana | Yes | No | Rhode Island | No | |
| Iowa | Yes | Yes | South Carolina | No | |
| Kansas | Yes | Yes | South Dakota | No | |
| Kentucky | Yes | No | Tennessee | | |
| Louisiana | No | | Texas | Yes | |
| Maine | No | | Utah | Yes | Yes. |
| Maryland | Yes | No | Vermont | No | |
| Massachusetts | No ³ | No | Virginia | Yes | No. |
| Michigan | Yes | Yes | Washington | Yes | No. |
| Minnesota | Yes | No | West Virginia | Yes | Yes. |
| Mississippi | No | | Wisconsin | Yes | No. |
| Missouri | Yes | No | Wyoming | Yes | No. |

¹ User must be accompanied by licensed driver.² User need not be accompanied by licensed driver.³ Unlicensed driver must be accompanied by licensed driver.TABLE 11.—*Type of operator's license examination required by the various States, and renewal provisions*

| State | Examination on rules | Vision test | Driving test | Renewal |
|---|----------------------|-------------|--------------|-----------------------------------|
| Uniform Vehicle Code, Act II, secs. 17, 22. | Yes | Yes | Yes | July 1, (second) or (third) year. |
| Alabama | Yes | Yes | Yes | Annually. |
| Arizona | Yes | Yes | Yes | Good until revoked. |
| Arkansas | Yes | Yes | Yes | Annually, Dec. 31. |
| California | Yes | Yes | Yes | 4 years. |
| Colorado | Yes | Yes | Yes | July 1, third year. |
| Connecticut | Yes | Yes | Yes | April 30, each year. |
| Delaware | Yes | Yes | Yes | Annually and permanent. |
| District of Columbia | Yes | Yes | Yes | 3 years. |
| Florida | Yes | Yes | Yes | Oct. 1, each year. |
| Georgia | Yes | Yes | Yes | Annually, June 30. |
| Idaho | Yes | Yes | Yes | Every other birthday. |
| Illinois | Yes | Yes | Yes | 3 years. |
| Indiana | Yes | Yes | Yes | (?) |
| Iowa | Yes | Yes | Yes | Every other birthday. |
| Kansas ¹ | Yes | (?) | Yes | July 1, each odd year. |

¹ End of month, after every other birthday.² Examination not required.

TABLE 11.—*Type of operator's license examination required by the various States, and renewal provisions—Continued*

| State | Examina- tion on rules | Vision test | Driving test | Renewal | |
|---------------------------------|------------------------------|------------------------|-----------------|---|--|
| | | | | | |
| Kentucky..... | Yes..... | Yes..... | Yes..... | Annually, July 31. | |
| Louisiana..... | | | | | |
| Maine..... | (?)..... | (?)..... | (?)..... | Annually, Dec. 31. | |
| Maryland..... | Yes..... | Yes..... | Yes..... | Good until revoked. | |
| Massachusetts..... | Yes..... | Yes..... | Yes..... | 2 years. | |
| Michigan..... | Yes..... | Yes..... | No..... | 3 years. | |
| Minnesota..... | Yes..... | Yes ⁴ | Yes..... | Fourth succeeding birthday. | |
| Mississippi..... | Yes..... | Yes..... | Yes..... | 1 year from issuance. | |
| Missouri ² | | | | June 30, each even year. | |
| Montana..... | Yes..... | Yes..... | Yes..... | Annually, Dec. 31. | |
| Nebraska..... | Yes..... | Yes..... | Yes..... | Sept. 1, each odd year. | |
| Nevada..... | Yes..... | Yes..... | Yes..... | July 1, each odd year. | |
| New Hampshire..... | Yes..... | Yes..... | Yes..... | Annually, on birthday. | |
| New Jersey..... | Yes..... | Yes..... | Yes..... | Annually, Mar. 1. | |
| New Mexico..... | (?)..... | Yes..... | Yes..... | Annually, Dec. 31. | |
| New York..... | Yes..... | Yes..... | Yes..... | 1 and 3 years. | |
| North Carolina..... | Yes..... | Yes..... | Yes..... | Fourth succeeding birthday. | |
| North Dakota ³ | | | | June 30, every 2 years. | |
| Ohio..... | (?)..... | Yes..... | Yes..... | Annually, Sept. 30. | |
| Oklahoma..... | Yes..... | Yes..... | Yes..... | Jan. 1, biennially second year from issuance. | |
| Oregon..... | Yes..... | Yes..... | Yes..... | June 30 each odd year. | |
| Pennsylvania..... | Yes..... | Yes..... | Yes..... | Annually Jan. 31. | |
| Rhode Island..... | Yes..... | Yes..... | Yes..... | Sept. 30 following date of issue. | |
| South Carolina..... | Yes..... | (?)..... | Yes..... | June 30. | |
| South Dakota ³ | | | | | |
| Tennessee..... | Yes..... | Yes..... | Yes..... | July 1, each odd year. | |
| Texas..... | Yes..... | Yes..... | Yes..... | 2 years from issuance. | |
| Utah..... | Yes..... | Yes..... | Yes..... | 3 years from issuance. | |
| Vermont..... | Yes..... | Yes..... | Yes..... | Annually, May 31. | |
| Virginia..... | Yes..... | Yes..... | Yes..... | 3 years from issuance. | |
| Washington..... | Yes..... | Yes..... | Yes..... | July 31, each odd year. | |
| West Virginia..... | Yes..... | Yes..... | Yes..... | 4 years from date of issuance. | |
| Wisconsin..... | Yes..... | Yes..... | Yes..... | Do. | |
| Wyoming ³ | Yes..... | Yes..... | Yes..... | | |

² Examination not required.³ Physical examination and examination by actual demonstration or otherwise.⁴ No license denied an applicant on sole ground of deficient color perception.³ No operator's license.TABLE 12.—*Minimum age for chauffeur's license*

| State | License required ¹ | Minimum age | Minimum age for— | |
|---|-------------------------------|----------------|----------------------|-----------------------------|
| | | | School bus driver | Common carrier driver |
| Uniform Vehicle Code, Act II, secs. 8, 10, 11 | | | Years | Years |
| Alabama..... | Yes..... | 18 | 21 | 21 |
| | No..... | | | |
| Arizona..... | Yes..... | 18 | 21 | |
| Arkansas..... | Yes..... | 18 | 21 | 21 |
| California..... | Yes..... | 18 | 18 | |
| Colorado..... | Yes..... | 17 | 17 | |
| Connecticut..... | Yes..... | 18 | (?) | |

¹ Other than operator's license.² Must have certificate of qualification.

TABLE 12.—*Minimum age for chauffeur's license*—Continued

| State | License required ¹ | Minimum age | Minimum age for— | |
|----------------------|-------------------------------|-------------|-------------------|-----------------------|
| | | | School bus driver | Common carrier driver |
| Delaware | Yes | 18 | Years | Years |
| District of Columbia | No | 16 | 21 | 16 |
| Florida | Yes | 16 | 21 | — |
| Georgia | Yes | 18 | 18 | — |
| Idaho | Yes | 18 | 16 | — |
| Illinois | Yes | 18 | 21 | 18 |
| Indiana | Yes | 18 | 21 | 21 |
| Iowa | Yes | 17 | 16 | 21 |
| Kansas | Yes | 18 | 16 | 21 |
| Kentucky | No | 18 | 21 | — |
| Louisiana | Yes | 18 | (?) | — |
| Maine | No | — | — | — |
| Maryland | Yes | 16 | 18 | 18 |
| Massachusetts | No | — | 21 | 21 |
| Michigan | Yes | 18 | 21 | 21 |
| Minnesota | Yes | 18 | (?) | 18 |
| Mississippi | Yes | 17 | 17 | 17 |
| Missouri | Yes | 18 | 21 | 21 |
| Montana | Yes | 18 | 21 | 21 |
| Nebraska | — | 16 | 16 | 16 |
| Nevada | Yes | 18 | 18 | 18 |
| New Hampshire | Yes | 18 | 18 | 18 |
| New Jersey | — | 17 | 21 | 17 |
| New Mexico | Yes | 18 | (?) | (?) |
| New York | Yes | 18 | (?) | (?) |
| North Carolina | Yes | 18 | (?) | (?) |
| North Dakota | No | (?) | — | — |
| Ohio | Yes | 16 | (?) | (?) |
| Oklahoma | Yes | 18 | (?) | (?) |
| Oregon | Yes | 18 | 18 | 21 |
| Pennsylvania | No | — | — | — |
| Rhode Island | No | — | — | — |
| South Carolina | No | — | — | — |
| South Dakota | No | — | — | — |
| Tennessee | Yes | 18 | 21 | 21 |
| Texas | Yes | 16 | — | 21 |
| Utah | Yes | 18 | 21 | 21 |
| Vermont | No | — | — | — |
| Virginia | Yes | 18 | 18 | 21 |
| Washington | No | — | — | — |
| West Virginia | Yes | 16 | 21 | 21 |
| Wisconsin | No | — | — | — |
| Wyoming | Yes | 18 | — | — |

¹ Other than operator's license.² Common carrier of persons.⁴ Restricted.⁵ To operate a 1½-ton truck.⁶ For private chauffeur; all other chauffeurs except those operating under Texas Railroad Commission, 17; operating under Texas Railroad Commission, 21.

TABLE 13.—*Type of chauffeur's license examination required by the various States*

| State | Examina-tion required | Written test | Vision test | Driving test | Oral test | Photo | Finger-print | Color test |
|--|-----------------------|------------------|-------------|--------------|-----------|----------|--------------|------------|
| Uniform Vehicle Code, Act II, sees. 8, 17, 18 (b). | Yes..... | Oral or written. | Yes..... | Yes..... | | Yes..... | | |
| Alabama ¹ | No..... | | | | | | | |
| Arizona..... | Yes..... | Yes..... | Yes..... | Yes..... | | Yes..... | | |
| Arkansas..... | Yes..... | Yes..... | Yes..... | Yes..... | | Yes..... | | |
| California..... | Yes..... | Yes..... | Yes..... | Yes..... | | | (?) | |
| Colorado..... | Yes..... | Yes..... | Yes..... | Yes..... | | Yes..... | | |
| Connecticut..... | Yes..... | Yes..... | Yes..... | Yes..... | | | (?) | |
| Delaware..... | Yes..... | Yes..... | Yes..... | Yes..... | | Yes..... | | |
| District of Columbia..... | Yes..... | Yes..... | Yes..... | Yes..... | | Yes..... | | |
| Florida..... | Yes..... | Yes..... | Yes..... | Yes..... | | | | |
| Georgia..... | Yes..... | Yes..... | Yes..... | Yes..... | | | | |
| Idaho..... | Yes..... | Yes..... | Yes..... | Yes..... | | Yes..... | | |
| Illinois..... | Yes..... | (?) | (?) | (?) | | Yes..... | | |
| Indiana..... | Yes..... | (?) | Yes..... | Yes..... | (?) | Yes..... | | (?) |
| Iowa..... | Yes..... | Yes..... | Yes..... | Yes..... | | (?) | (?) | |
| Kansas..... | No..... | | | | | Yes..... | | |
| Kentucky ¹ | No..... | | | | | | | |
| Louisiana ² | No..... | | | | | | | |
| Maine ¹ | No..... | | | | | | | |
| Maryland..... | Yes..... | | Yes..... | Yes..... | | | | |
| Massachusetts ¹ | No..... | | | | | | | |
| Michigan..... | Yes..... | Yes..... | Yes..... | Yes..... | | Yes..... | | |
| Minnesota..... | Yes..... | Yes..... | Yes..... | No..... | | | | |
| Mississippi..... | Yes..... | Yes..... | Yes..... | Yes..... | | | | |
| Missouri ¹ | No..... | | | | | Yes..... | | |
| Montana..... | Yes..... | Oral or written. | Yes..... | Yes..... | | | | |
| Nebraska ³ | No..... | | | | | | | |
| Nevada..... | Yes..... | Yes..... | Yes..... | Yes..... | | Yes..... | | |
| New Hampshire..... | Yes..... | Yes..... | Yes..... | Yes..... | | | | |
| New Jersey..... | Yes..... | Yes..... | Yes..... | Yes..... | | | | |
| New Mexico..... | Yes..... | Yes..... | Yes..... | Yes..... | Yes..... | | | |
| New York..... | Yes..... | Yes..... | Yes..... | Yes..... | Yes..... | Yes..... | | |
| North Carolina..... | Yes..... | Yes..... | Yes..... | Yes..... | Yes..... | | | |
| North Dakota ⁴ | No..... | | | | | | | |
| Ohio..... | Yes..... | Yes..... | Yes..... | Yes..... | | Yes..... | | |
| Oklahoma..... | Yes..... | Yes..... | Yes..... | Yes..... | | Yes..... | | |
| Oregon..... | Yes..... | Yes..... | Yes..... | Yes..... | | | | |
| Pennsylvania ¹ | No..... | | | | | | | |
| Rhode Island ¹ | No..... | | | | | | | |
| South Carolina ¹ | No..... | | | | | | | |
| South Dakota ¹ | No..... | | | | | | | |
| Tennessee..... | Yes..... | Yes..... | Yes..... | Yes..... | | Yes..... | | |
| Texas..... | Yes..... | Yes..... | Yes..... | Yes..... | Yes..... | | | |
| Utah..... | Yes..... | Yes..... | Yes..... | Yes..... | | Yes..... | | |
| Vermont ¹ | No..... | | | | | | | |
| Virginia..... | Yes..... | Yes..... | Yes..... | Yes..... | | | | |
| Washington ¹ | No..... | | | | | | | |
| West Virginia..... | Yes..... | Yes..... | Yes..... | Yes..... | | | | |
| Wisconsin ¹ | No..... | | | | | | | |
| Wyoming ¹ | No..... | | | | | | | |

¹ No special chauffeur's license.² Optional.³ Public service operator.⁴ May be required by department.⁵ No chauffeur's license law. Permits issued by some cities.⁶ Same as operator's license.⁷ May be required to demonstrate.

TABLE 14.—*Chauffeur's license expiration and renewal provisions of the various States*

| State | Renewal required | Expiration |
|---|------------------|---|
| Uniform Vehicle Code, Act II, sec. 22. | Yes----- | Annually, July 1. |
| Alabama----- | Yes----- | No chauffeur's license. |
| Arizona----- | Yes----- | Annually, Dec. 31. |
| Arkansas----- | Yes----- | Annually, Jan. 1. |
| California----- | Yes----- | 4 years from date of issue. |
| Colorado----- | Yes----- | Annually. |
| Connecticut----- | Yes----- | Annually, Apr. 30. |
| Delaware----- | Yes----- | Two types: annual and permanent. |
| District of Columbia----- | Yes----- | Public vehicle operator annually. |
| Florida----- | Yes----- | Annually, Oct. 1. |
| Georgia----- | Yes----- | Annually, June 30. |
| Idaho----- | Yes----- | Annually, July 1. |
| Illinois----- | Yes----- | Annually, Dec. 31. |
| Indiana----- | Yes----- | Last day of February of following year. |
| Iowa----- | Yes----- | Annually, Dec. 31. |
| Kansas----- | Yes----- | July 1, each odd year. |
| Kentucky----- | | No chauffeur's license. |
| Louisiana----- | Yes----- | Annually, Dec. 31. |
| Maine----- | | No chauffeur's license. |
| Maryland----- | Yes----- | 2 years from date of issue. |
| Massachusetts----- | | No chauffeur's license. |
| Michigan----- | Yes----- | Annually. |
| Minnesota----- | Yes----- | Annually, Dec. 31. |
| Mississippi----- | Yes----- | 1 year from date of issue. |
| Missouri----- | Yes----- | Annually, Dec. 31. |
| Montana----- | Yes----- | Do. |
| Nebraska----- | | No chauffeur's license. Same as operator's license. |
| Nevada----- | Yes----- | Annually, July 1. |
| New Hampshire----- | Yes----- | Annually, birthday. |
| New Jersey----- | Yes----- | Annually, Mar. 31. |
| New Mexico----- | Yes----- | Annually, Dec. 31. |
| New York----- | Yes----- | Two types: 1 year and 3 years. |
| North Carolina----- | Yes----- | Annually, June 30. |
| North Dakota----- | Yes----- | Biennially, June 30. |
| Ohio----- | Yes----- | Annually, Oct. 1. |
| Oklahoma----- | Yes----- | Jan. 1, second year from date of issue. |
| Oregon----- | Yes----- | Annually, Dec. 31. |
| Pennsylvania----- | | No chauffeur's license. |
| Rhode Island----- | | Do. |
| South Carolina----- | | Do. |
| South Dakota----- | | Do. |
| Tennessee----- | Yes----- | Annually, July 1. |
| Texas----- | Yes----- | 1 year from date of issue. |
| Utah----- | Yes----- | 3 years from date of issue. |
| Vermont----- | | No chauffeur's license. |
| Virginia----- | Yes----- | 1 year from date of issue. |
| Washington----- | | No chauffeur's license. |
| West Virginia----- | Yes----- | Annually. |
| Wisconsin----- | | No chauffeur's license. |
| Wyoming----- | | |

TABLE 15.—*The various types of safety-responsibility laws¹*
(This analysis does not cover laws applicable to motor carriers or for-hire vehicles)

| State | Compul- sory insurance? | Accidents | | Convic- tions, proof required? | Judge- ments, satisfac- tion and/ or proof required? | Proof required in other events |
|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------|---|---|---|
| | | Security required? | Proof required? | | | |
| Uniform Vehicle Code, Act IV. | No. | Yes..... | Yes..... | Yes..... | Yes..... | No. |
| Alabama..... | No. | No..... | No..... | Yes..... | Yes..... | No. |
| Arizona..... | No. | No..... | No..... | No..... | Yes..... | No. |
| California..... | No. | Yes..... | No..... | Yes..... | Yes..... | No. |
| Colorado..... | No. | Yes..... | No..... | Yes..... | Yes..... | No. |
| Connecticut..... | No ² | No..... | No..... | Yes..... | No..... | Yes. ³ |
| Delaware..... | No. | No..... | No..... | Yes..... | Yes..... | No. |
| District of Columbia..... | No. | No..... | No..... | Yes..... | Yes..... | No. |
| Florida..... | No. | No..... | Yes..... | No..... | No..... | No. |
| Georgia..... | No. | No..... | No..... | No..... | Yes..... | No. |
| Hawaii..... | No ⁴ | No..... | Yes ⁵ | Yes..... | Yes..... | No. |
| Idaho..... | No. | No..... | No..... | Yes..... | Yes..... | No. |
| Illinois..... | No. | Yes..... | No..... | Yes..... | Yes..... | No. |
| Indiana..... | No. | Yes..... | Yes ⁶ | Yes..... | Yes..... | No. |
| Iowa..... | No. | Yes..... | No..... | Yes..... | Yes..... | No. |
| Kansas..... | No. | No..... | No..... | Yes..... | Yes..... | No. |
| Kentucky..... | No. | Yes..... | No..... | Yes..... | Yes..... | No. |
| Maine..... | No. | Yes..... | Yes..... | Yes..... | Yes..... | No. |
| Maryland..... | No. | Yes..... | No..... | Yes..... | Yes..... | No. |
| Massachusetts..... | Yes ⁷ | (*) | | | Yes ⁸ | |
| Michigan..... | No. | Yes..... | Yes..... | Yes..... | Yes..... | No. |
| Minnesota..... | No. | Yes..... | No..... | Yes..... | Yes..... | No. |
| Montana..... | No. | No..... | No..... | Yes..... | Yes..... | No. |
| Nebraska..... | No. | Yes..... | No..... | Yes..... | Yes..... | No. |
| Nevada..... | No. | No..... | Yes..... | No..... | No..... | No. |
| New Hampshire..... | No. | Yes..... | Yes..... | Yes..... | Yes..... | No. |
| New Jersey..... | No. | No..... | Yes ¹⁰ | Yes..... | Yes..... | Yes. ¹¹ |
| New Mexico..... | No. | No..... | Yes..... | Yes..... | Yes..... | No. |
| New York..... | No. | Yes..... | Yes..... | Yes..... | Yes..... | Yes. ¹² |
| North Carolina..... | No. | No..... | No..... | No..... | Yes..... | No. |
| North Dakota..... | No. | No..... | No..... | Yes..... | Yes..... | No. |
| Ohio..... | No. | No..... | No..... | Yes..... | Yes..... | No. |

¹ This table and the footnotes that follow are in the main taken direct from an analysis of the automobile liability laws of the United States, including the Massachusetts compulsory insurance law, published Dec. 1, 1945, by the Association of Casualty and Surety Executives, New York. The table has been revised, however, to include changes since the 1945 analysis was published.

² Vehicles owned by minors cannot be registered unless proof filed; minors between 16 and 18 may operate only insured vehicles.

³ Where a person's record warrants it.

⁴ Minors under 15 must furnish proof as a prerequisite to issuance of chauffeur's license or registration.

⁵ Until proof furnished, license not to be issued to person who within 12 months preceding application had more than 2 accidents due to his own negligence, which caused injury to persons or damage to property amounting in the aggregate to more than \$200. No provision for termination of requirement of proof.

⁶ In discretion of department.

⁷ For death and personal injury only.

⁸ Nonresident can be required to furnish security to satisfy judgment after specific action brought against him.

⁹ Judgment satisfaction, on request of judgment creditor, for damage to property unless minimum of \$1,000 insurance in force.

¹⁰ Proof to be required from driver or owner, or both, of vehicle concerned in accident causing injury or damage of at least \$25, except where not at fault in the opinion of the Commissioner. By ruling of the Commissioner this provision is not enforced unless a judgment is obtained against the person concerned in the accident.

¹¹ Upon suspension or revocation in any other State.

¹² Upon any reasonable ground appearing on the records.

TABLE 15.—*The various types of safety-responsibility laws*¹—Continued

| State | Compul-sory insurance? | Accidents | | Convic-tions, proof required? | Judge-ments, satisfac-tion, and/or proof required? | Proof required in other events |
|---------------|------------------------|---------------------|-------------------|-------------------------------|--|--------------------------------|
| | | Securi-ty required? | Proof required? | | | |
| Oregon | No. | No. | Yes ¹³ | Yes | Yes | Yes. ¹¹ |
| Pennsylvania | No. | Yes ¹⁴ | Yes ¹⁵ | Yes | Yes | No. |
| Rhode Island | No ¹⁶ | No | Yes ¹⁷ | Yes | Yes | Yes. ¹⁸ |
| South Dakota | No. | No | No | Yes | Yes | No. |
| Tennessee | No. | No | No | No | Yes | No. |
| Utah | No. | No | No | Yes | Yes | No. |
| Vermont | No. | Yes | Yes ¹⁹ | Yes | Yes | No. |
| Virginia | No. | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes. ¹² |
| Washington | No. | Yes ²⁰ | No | Yes | Yes | No. ²¹ |
| West Virginia | No. | No | No | Yes | Yes | No. |
| Wisconsin | No. | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | Yes. ²¹ |
| Wyoming | No. | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | No. |

¹ This table and the footnotes that follow are in the main taken direct from an analysis of the automobile liability laws of the United States, including the Massachusetts compulsory insurance law, published Dec. 1, 1945, by the Association of Casualty and Surety Executives, New York. The table has been revised, however, to include changes since the 1945 analysis was published.

¹¹ Upon suspension or revocation in any other State.

¹² Upon any reasonable ground appearing on the records.

¹³ Unless proof filed, license of operator and registrations of owner of vehicle involved in accident resulting in any third-party injury or damage shall be suspended. Inapplicable if vehicle insured or parked. Proof to be maintained for 3 years from date of accident.

¹⁴ Effective July 1, 1949.

¹⁵ Unless proof given, license not to be issued or renewed to person who within 12 months had one or more accidents, due wholly or partly to his negligence, which caused injury to persons or damage to property aggregating more than \$100; license may be suspended after bearing unless proof furnished where person had accident, caused by his negligence, which caused injury to persons or damage to property aggregating more than \$100. No suspension where all claims paid or insurance was carried. Requirement of proof may be terminated after 3 years from time first required or furnished.

¹⁶ Minors owning motor vehicles must furnish proof before registration.

¹⁷ When a motor vehicle is involved in any accident resulting in bodily injury, or property damage totaling \$100, and, upon investigation, it appears that the operator has violated any of the rules of the road or certain other provisions, the division shall require proof for 1 year from the operator, owner, or both.

¹⁸ From any person whose license has been suspended or refused.

¹⁹ Proof to be required from operator of vehicle involved in accident resulting in bodily injury, or in property damage of \$75, when Commissioner after full investigation finds operator at fault. Commissioner may terminate requirement after 3 years.

²⁰ Effective Feb. 1, 1950.

²¹ From habitually reckless or negligent driver or habitual violator of traffic laws.

Committee on Laws and Ordinances

Chairman:

HONORABLE REVA BECK BOSONE
Member of Congress, Utah

Vice-Chairman:

GEORGE R. WELLINGTON
Chief of Safety Section
Bureau of Motor Carriers
Interstate Commerce Commission
Washington, D. C.

Secretary:

J. ALLEN DAVIS
General Counsel, Automobile Club of Southern California
Los Angeles, Calif.

Co-Secretary:

CHARLES W. STARK, Secretary
National Committee on Uniform Traffic
Laws and Ordinances
Washington, D. C.

The final Conference-approved edition of this report will contain a complete list of the members of the Committee on Laws and Ordinances.

